DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 600 UD 026 760

TITLE Schools of Choice: An Annotated Catalog of Key Choice Elements: Open Enrollment, Diversity and Empowerment.

INSTITUTION Metropolitan Affairs Corp., Detroit, MI.; Oakland Univ., Rochester, MI. School of Human and Educational Services.

PUB DATE 88

NOTE 69p.

PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; Case Studies; Catalogs; *Cultural Awareness; Cultural Differences; *Demonstration Programs; Elementary Schools; Elementary Secondary Education; *Open Enrollment; Parent Participation; Public Schools; *School Choice; School Community Relationship; Secondary Schools; State Surveys; Teacher Role; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

This catalog, an outcome of the Project To Access Choice in Education (PACE), lists examples of public schools throughout the nation offering choices in education. "Schools of Choice" are defined as those offering one or more of the following three dynamics: (1) open enrollment, the freedom for families to choose the elementary or secondary full-time public school of attendance; (2) teacher empowerment, the opportunity for a school staff to create their own organization and program components; and (3) diversity, the creation or organization of program components to reflect the diferences in student and community needs, interests, and preferences. Data were collected from a literature review, 200 mail surveys, interviews with authorities in the field of educational choice, and visits to school districts. Chapter 1, "The PACE Project," discusses the PACE model, describes the research methodology, summarizes the survey findings, and draws conclusions and recommendations. Chapter 2, "Case Studies," comprises detailed analyses of five school districts identified as representative of one or more of the three elements of choice. The districts (listed with their choice elements) are as follows: (1) Dade County Public Schools (Florida), Limited Open Enrollment/Diversity; (2) Detroit Public Schools (Michigan), Limited Open Enrollment/Diversity; (3) District 4--New York City (New York), Open Enrollment/Diversity/Empowerment; (4) Flint Public Schools (Michigan), Limited Open Enrollment/Diversity; and (5) Rochester City School District (New York), Limited Open Enrollment/Diversity. Chapter 3, "Narratives of Other School Districts," provides brief descriptions of 26 school districts. Each narrative lists the choice options, address, phone number, contact person, brief enrollment and staff profile and a description of the choice options and how they are administered. The appendix contains a copy of the survey data verification letter, a 13-item annotated bibliography, and a 117-item bibliography. (FMW)

5-5-89

ED329600

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. David Sanders

Metropolitan Affairs Corporation

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Schools of Choice

An annotated catalog of key choice elements: open enrollment, diversity and empowerment

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Metropolitan Affairs Corporation

UD026160

Metropolitan Affairs Corporation is...

. . .A private, non-profit organization supported by business, industry, labor and local government. The organization's main purpose is providing a much-needed link between the private and public sectors at the regional level by engaging in research and action programs for those areawide problems that transcend individual community boundaries.

MAC's program priorities include "Urgent Issues" which researches and stimulates action on such key public policy issues as K-12 education, venture capital financing, structural unemployment, regional infrastructure financing, regional interdependency and hazardous waste facility siting as well as "Joint Public Ventures" which supports more efficient delivery of public services through intergovernmental cooperation and coordination.

Metropolitan Affairs Corporation's Board of Directors is a coalition of business, labor, government and higher education. An Advisory Council to the Board of Directorss extends MAC's involvement throughout the regional private and public communities. The organization is funded by contributions from business, industry and labor (no tax dollars are used for support).

Re-structuring of K-12 public education has been a high priority on MAC's agenda since 1983. In 1985, a series of options for re-structuring public education were outlined in *Dialogue for Change.* MAC's commitment to schools of choice, educational diversity and teacher/administrator empowerment has been strengthened through subsequent editions of *Dialogue for Change* as well as this and other publications exploring those options.

Schools of Choice

An annotated catalog
of key choice elements:
open enrollment, diversity and empowerment

Published by
Metropolitan Affairs Corporation
in cooperation with the
Project
to Access Choice
in Education (PACE),
Oakland University

Detroit, Michigan
Rochester, Michigan
1988

Executive Summary

Improving the effectiveness of schools is an issue of concern to many people — school board members, administrators, teachers, parents, students, and citizens. It would be simplistic to suggest that there is anything remotely approaching a single, all-encompassing answer to the problems of education today. Indeed, the problems are many and varied. Similarly the options for change are also wide and varied. The PACE group believes that the areas targeted for change should be those which offer the maximum opportunity for change **now** and for possible future options for action. Our research group, working under the auspices of Oakland University and the Metropolitan Affairs Corporation, investigated one avenue toward better student outcomes — **Choice** — as it is available in public schools throughout the country.

PACE (The Project to Access Choice in Education) was developed through the collaborative efforts of a group of 12 practicing educators from Southeast Michigan. As an action research project, the group determined to catalog examples of public schools throughout the nation offering choices in education.

Our model for defining "Schools of Choice" included those offering one or more of three dynamics: **open enrollment, teacher empowerment,** and/or **diversity.** These three components on which we focused were defined as follows: open enrollment is the freedom for families to choose the elementary or secondary full-time public school of attendance; empowerment is the opportunity for school staff to create their own organization and program components; and, diversity is the creation or organization of program components to reflect the differences in student and community needs, interests, and preferences.

To collect the data for this catalog, the PACE group read extensively, mailed out over 200 surveys, interviewed authorities in the field of educational choice, and visited school districts.

As we approach the 21st century, the needs of students, family, business, and industry have changed and no longer fit the system of public education that evolved in the early 20th century. The PACE group has written this catalog to assist interested parties in their quest to restructure schools and provide educational opportunities that will meet the needs of students.

The following key points were developed by PACE based on interviews, readings, site visits, and surveys:

- Schools of Choice promote excellence in education;
- The dynamic model of Schools of Choice, presented by PACE, permits the flexibility necessary to meet changing educational demands of the 21st century,
- The most effective Schools of Choice are a systematic interrelation of the components of open enrollment, programmatic diversity, and empowerment;
- When open enrollment, diversity, and empowerment function in isolation, they do not maximize educational reform;
- Many attempts at school improvement hold a latent potential for developing a systematic approach required for implementation of Schools of Choice;
- Empowerment of the building administrators, teachers, parents, students, and the community will lead to increased commitment to facilitate excellence in schools;
- Programmatic diversity recognizes different instructional methods and subject matter that addresses students' differing educational needs;
- Open enrollment provides access to programmatic diversity;

- It is possible to establish Schools of Choice within a local public school district;
- Empowerment within the schools requires public understanding and legislative incentive in order for the concept to be implemented in a timely manner; and,
- Schools of Choice deserve financial support to sustain the reform efforts.

This catalog is dedicated
to
Dr. James Clatworthy
who got us started
and to
Dr. Jackie Scherer
who kept us going.

The PACE Group
Oakland University
1988

Acknowledgments

The team members of the Project to Access Choice in Education (PACE) wish to thank the organizations and individuals that provided information, support, encouragement, and criticism throughout the preparation of this catalog. Without both their direct and indirect assistance, this catalog would never have been published. Funding for this project came from the Metropolitan Affairs Corporation (MAC), and we gratefully acknowledge this contribution. In addition to their monetary support, MAC provided our group with a number of documents from months and even years past that had been collected as a part of the work they do. Mr. Donn Shelton of MAC served as our liaison, and was the person who proposed the topic of our project. The School of Human and Educational Services at Oakland University collected our mail, assisted in the printing and mailing of surveys, and provided us a place to meet. Dr. Joe Nathan and Dr. Mary Anne Raywid were conference call contacts who added clarity to our topic and provided us with many additional "sources for sources" as we searched for information. Finally, we would like to thank our instructors in the Oakland University Education Specialist program. Dr. Jackie Scherer, Dr. Roderic Righter, Dr. William Macauley, Dr. Gerald Pine, Dr. F. James Clatworthy, Dr. Marcee Martin, and Dr. Don Warren who were all very flexible and supportive in working with us and integrating our topic into their class sessions.

Project to Access Choice in Education

Kenneth Brach, Ed.S., Elementary School Teacher, Avondale School District, Auburn Hills, Michigan.

Stephen Cook, Ed.S., Counselor, Holly High School, Holly, Michigan

Barbara A. Ferguson, Ed.S., Elementary and Middle School Teacher, Brandon Schools, Ortonville, Michigan

Joan Grazda, Ed.S., Elementary Principal, Archdiocese of Detroit, St. Clair, Michigan

Constance Hamilton, Ed.S., Administrative Intern, Rochester Community Schools, Rochester, Michigan

The PACE Group
c/o Dean's Office — SHES
Oakland University
Rochester, MI 48309-4401

Toni Kasander, Ed.S., Secondary Special Education Chairperson and Workstudy Coordinator, Oak Park School District, Oak Park, Michigan

Gayle T. Krentler, Ed.S., Chapter I Math and Reading Consultant, Van Dyke Public Schools, Warren, Michigan

Wendy Neideck, Ed.S., Intern/Facilitator, Bloomfield Hills Schools, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan

Dennis Seppanen, Ed.S., Math Teacher, Troy Public Schools, Troy, Michigan

Richard Streetman, Ed.S., Assistant Headmaster, Kensington Academy, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan

Susan Teper, Ed.S., Media Specialist, Utica Community Schools, Utica, Michigan

Steven Wilcox, Ed.S., Elementary School Teacher, Rochester Community Schools, Rochester, Michigan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary iii
Acknowledgments vi
Chapter 1: The PACE Project
Introduction 1
The Elements
Open Enrollment 1
Diversity 1
Empowerment 2
Re-structuring Public Education 3
Methodology 4
Survey Findings 5
Conclusions and Recommendations 6
Chapter 2: Case Studies
Dade County Public Schools
(Limited Open Enrollment/Diversity) 9
Detroit Public Schools
(Limited Open Enrollment/Diversity) 15
District 4 — New York City
(Open Enrollment/Diversity/Empowerment) 19
Flint Public Schools
(Limited Open Enrollment/Diversity) 23
Rochester City School District
(Limited Open Enrollment/Diversity) 27
Chapter 3: Narratives of Other School Districts 33
Appendix:
Copy of the Survey
Data Verification Letter 47
Annotated Bibliography 55
Bibliography 57

Chapter 1

The PACE Project

Introduction

Across the nation, public Schools of Choice are being viewed as a viable way of encouraging students and staff to reach for excellence. However, there is some confusion as to what constitutes a School of Choice. While PACE cannot offer educational leaders one best formula for school reform, we do present our model as basic to meaningful and lasting school improvement.

Schools of Choice are public schools in which teachers, students and parents have some authority in overall decision-making. The idea of choice provides alternatives within public education and facilitates organizational responses to the demands of a changing society.

The Project to Access Choice in Education (PACE) examined three components of choice available in public schools. The three aspects which are the focus of this catalog are *Open Enrollment, Diversity* and *Teacher Empowerment.* The Project found that schools may exhibit different degrees of choice and are in varying stages of development. The model developed by PACE included these components because it is believed that when these are combined in a systematic and interrelated way they provide a powerful force for educational improvement.

Open Enrollment

As defined by PACE, open enrollment is the freedom for families to choose the elementary or secondary full-time public school of attendance. The term open enrollment dates back to the late 60's and early 70's. Early open enrollment plans appear to have been motivated by the desire to voluntarily counteract mandated school desegregation orders when there were racially segregated neighborhood schools. This type of open enrollment is not based on sound educational motives and therefore is often less educationally valid.

Current practices of open enrollment, while often considered for desegregation purposes, are usually combined with genuine opportunities for better education (Raywid, 1985). Such opportunities are a result of differentiation of school programs. If there are no clear grounds for distinguishing one choice option from another — for instance, no difference in curriculum or instructional approach — the opportunity to choose may be meaningless. Where substantive and visible differences are perceived, people might reasonably be expected to exercise their choice option (Raywid, 1985).

If enrollment is to be truly open, then every student and parent must be made aware of the options available. This means that school districts must make an effort to disseminate adequate information concerning the available options. Providing clear and comprehensive information to potential students and their parents, as well as to staff members of traditional schools, fosters informed choices (Fizzell, 1987). However, unless transportation is made available, open enrollment is not truly viable because not everyone would have equal access.

Diversity

Diversity is a condition which naturally exists in schools simply because each student possesses a unique set of attitudes and abilities. Student diversity, however, is often unmatched by programmatic diversity (programmatic diversity is the use of different instructional methods and subject matter that have been adopted by the district). It is for this reason the PACE group sought schools that have developed programs to meet the diverse needs of students, staff, parents and community. Some examples of programs created within the educational system in response to identified needs include Magnet schools, site-based management, schools-within-a-school, alternative schools, thematic schools and year-round schools.

A choice option in many school districts has been the Magnet school program. Magnet schools are

defined as schools that offer special programs that all students in the district can select if they meet the educational, racial, and/or gender requirements. Fleming's study (1982) identified more than 1,000 Magnet schools and programs in districts of 20,000 or more students. Approximately one-third of the nation's districts this size now have Magnet schools (Blank et.al., 1983). Magnets, however, are still largely an urban phenomenon. It is the PACE view that while open enrollment is — "The freedom for families to choose the elementary or secondary full-time public school of attendance" — it cannot exist with any measure of success where there is no programmatic diversity.

Students are better and more enthusiastic learners when they are able to choose a strategy compatible with their learning styles. Open classroom, cooperative learning, cross-age grouping, continuous progress, team teaching, block time, Montessori, and gifted-talented are strategies that meet the needs of different students. When students can select the subject matter that blends in best with their own learning style and interest area or preference, educational success is more likely (Clinchy, 1986).

It is important for teachers as well as students to have a choice of program participation. A national survey (Raywid, 1982) found that 85% of the teachers in alternative schools have chosen to be there. Alternative school teachers have a significant role in decisions regarding school goals, curriculum, staffing, evaluation and budget allocation in 90% of the nation's alternative schools.

Empowerment

In an educational setting, empowerment is a theory of organizational and management decision-making. It is based on the belief that participants value an environment they have helped to create. When this philosophical orientation becomes embodied in school policy, power shifts within the school organization. Decisions are made, in accordance with the articulated vision, by the staff, students and parents of a particular unit. The PACE Group investigated programs representing various stages of empowerment because it believes that this is the organizational goal to be attained.

Empowerment focuses attention on the perceived needs of the site — those needs being defined by administration, teachers, staff, parents, students and/or other community members. An essential element in an effective school is a shared vision of why and how goals can be accomplished. This can only result from a school climate that encourages participation, interaction, support and a belief in shared ownership of decisions and open communication among staff members. An empowered staff would have decision-making authority in such areas as curriculum, instructional materials, teaching techniques, staff development, disciplinary procedures, budgeting, monitoring, accountability and staff hiring. Empowerment is the essential element in the professionalization of teaching. Until this concept is embodied in school policy along with open enrollment and programmatic diversity, much reform will be superficial and transitory.

Re-Structuring Public Education

The educational management systems that have been used in the past have followed an industrial model that respected obedience and uniformity. In the post-industrial era, work patterns have shifted with an emphasis on intellectual choices and social skills. For empowerment to be successful, there must be decentralization. Administrators must develop trust and confidence in teachers; teachers must develop the necessary decision-making skills and the self-confidence to deal with the issues involved in site-based management. Schools must change and become flexible in organizational and teaching styles. It is vital to the future of schools that leaders inspire students and staff that are committed to excellence. Shared decision-making appears to be the only viable process to provide the flexibility required (Scherer, 1988).

When a school community is allowed to create its own organization and program components, it assumes the responsibility for creating and attaining a vision that encompasses the goals and values shared by the group. This is possible when teachers actually accept the responsibility to make changes within a school district.

Historically, local public schools or private schools have been the only choice options available to parents for their children's education. Parents could select a school district by deciding to live within that district and a school by choosing to live within its attendance boundaries. Sometimes, even this decision is taken from the parents due to population changes, economic conditions, classroom limits or desegregation mandates.

Parents have tended to prefer neighborhood schools because of their security, proximity and familiarity. Goodlad (1984) discovered that parents gave low marks to other schools in a district, but they tended to grade their neighborhood school as acceptable or even outstanding.

However, the structure of society is changing. The nuclear family of a father, mother and children under the age of eighteen as of 1985 was only 28% in the United States. This is down from 40% in 1970 (Bureau of the Census, 1987). 10% of all families are now comprised of a mother who stays at home, a father who works, and children (Hodgkinson, 1987). Many families are comprised of single parents who work away from the neighborhood and children who attend schools far from their parents' jobs. Seventy-two percent of women with children under the age of six are now in the workforce and women head 16.2% of all households with school age children. By 1990, women will make up one-half of the U.S. workforce and 10 million preschoolers and 18 to 20 million school age youngsters will be participating in some form of day care or latch key program. (Banach, 1987). In order to meet the changing needs of today's family, more parents are looking for an alternative to the traditional neighborhood school structure.

In February, 1987, the Michigan State Board of Education appointed a commission composed of leaders in business, industry, agriculture, labor, the State Legislature, education and government. One of its charges was to make recommendations regarding how equal educational opportunities can best be achieved. One of the commission's recommendations was that whenever feasible, school districts should be encouraged to permit parents to choose a public school within the district to which they will send their children. Another proposal called for the state fostering changes which empower local educators and parents to improve education.

The Washington State Board of Education approved 21 projects in 1988 that represent a pioneering statewide effort to encourage individual schools and districts to experiment with reforms of their own.

Some other states are reacting to the needs of the community through legislation. In May, 1988, the Minnesota Legislature passed state-wide choice initiatives which allow students to attend schools in districts other than their home district. Two reasons for this legislation have been presented by Governor Rudy Perpich: first, parents should be able to select where they send their children to school; and, second, school boards should have to respond to market forces.

Parental choice will create a healthy climate of competition among districts. If schools don't want to lose students, they will provide the kinds of programs that will keep the students in the district (Randall, 1986). This is an important point because, unless schools are somehow different, there is little incentive for parents to choose one over another. Schools of choice must offer valid educational experience or close their doors.

In his 1984 study of 1000 classrooms, Goodlad found that teachers who were innovative or deviated from the "norm" were not being allowed to carry out

many of their ideas. He concluded that teachers needed to be empowered and treated as professionals or America will not have significantly better schools or higher achievement than the present. Nearly 20 years ago, Drucker (1969) recommended that more responsibility needed to be transferred to individual schools. He felt it would not increase bureaucracy but would turn schools into organizations run by people who operate as pure professionals and not as a collection of superiors and subordinates.

East Baton Rouge Parish School System is meeting Drucker's challenge by implementing an experiment that combines school-based management with parental choice. The plan's supporters expect that student achievement will improve in a way that is not possible under the traditional school structure. They also hope to end the district's problem with racial imbalance. Parents, teachers, principals and community members conducted needs assessments of their schools and outlined enhancements they plan to have in place in the fall of 1988.

Change is never easy but the restructuring of K-12 education is an idea whose time has come. Those districts which have provided choices have found the following:

- dropouts are reduced
- student achievement and appreciation of learning are increased
- parental involvement and satisfaction have improved
- racial and economic integration are encouraged
- students who are dissatisfied with conventional programs are challenged
  and
- the morale is raised of educators who have been allowed to create distinctive programs (Nathan, 1987).

Banach (1987) states that market-driven schools — that is, those that are trying to meet the long-range, changing needs of their students — tend to have a vision, a mission and goals. They tend to involve staff in planning, and they tend to be consumer-sensitive. They tend — quite simply — to be better schools.

Methodology

In the summer of 1987, the PACE group became interested in the work being done by The Metropolitan Affairs Corporation (MAC) in the area of choice through their publications and video tapes. The team contacted Donn Shelton of the Metropolitan Affairs Corporation regarding the possibility of collaborating on a project. Shelton encouraged the team to pursue their efforts and suggested that the team explore specific aspects of Schools of Choice and produce a catalog that would be made available to various educators, legislators and other interested parties.

In September of that year, the team worked with Dr. Marcee Martin of the Royal Oak Schools. Together they prepared a proposal to submit to the Metropolitan Affairs Corporation for approval. The team also investigated other sources of funding to supplement the grant made available by MAC. Preliminary work was begun on survey tools to be used in the research.

The PACE group then began examining examples of public schools throughout the country that offered the choices in education that we had defined as open enrollment, diversity, and empowerment. A list of over 200 school districts, thought to exhibit one or more of these choices, was compiled through a variety of methods:

1) conference phone calls with Joe Nathan and Mary Anne Raywid, experts in the field of educational choice;

2) individual phone calls with over 20 authorities on educational choice;

3) extensive readings and research on choice in public schools and related educational topics;

4) personal contacts by members of the PACE group; and

5) phone contacts with school districts known to utilize choice.

An initial screening device was developed as well as an interview form. Approximately 24 school districts were contacted and a personal interview was conducted with a top administrator in the district. From this, questions were prepared for a work survey.

During the winter of 1988, the team worked with Dr. Don Warren of Oakland University, to prepare the survey that was to be mailed to school districts throughout the country. Three aspects of the elements of Schools of Choice were included; *open enrollment*, defined as the freedom for families to choose the elementary or secondary full-time public school of attendance, *empowerment*, defined as the opportunity for school staff to create its own organization and program components; and, *diversity*, defined as the creation or organization of program components reflecting differences in student and community needs, interests, and preferences. Also, a site visit survey was developed and tested in the Flint Community School District.

In the early spring of 1988, approximately 200 surveys were sent to school districts throughout the United States and Canada. The questionnaire covered the topics of open enrollment, empowerment, and diversity. Seventy-nine districts responded, representing a return of 39.5 percent.

Using the responses, PACE chose the districts which most closely followed the model of Schools of Choice as defined by the team. Team members then visited these districts to study more closely the elements of choice that were apparent in their survey responses. Rochester, New York; District 4-New York City, New York; Dade County, Florida; and Detroit and Flint, Michigan were visited and case studies written. Follow-up phone calls and letters were used to clarify survey responses that were either unclear or vague and the narrative entries were completed. The case studies and the narratives are presented in this catalog: Schools of Choice.

The team realizes the limitations of the survey. We had decided to focus on school districts and not on individual school programs. This direction did not allow individual school programs to be researched. Confusion in the empowerment section of the survey resulted from the term "professional staff" when we meant teachers or principals and teachers. We found that just because a staff had the power to select textbooks, did not necessarily mean they were empowered to create their own programs. The survey also placed too much emphasis on teaching methods as opposed to programmatic diversity. Programs are constantly being developed and so there are many exciting new choice options that are not mentioned in our publication.

The final product is this catalog. The PACE group provides a guidebook for educators, school boards, parents, and community members who are interested in the restructuring of America's public education system. The PACE group further presents and recommends a dynamic model of Schools of Choice featuring the components of open enrollment, programmatic diversity, and empowerment. **Choice is more than a program; it is a philosophical principle that is based on the recognition that the participants in education should have options.**

SURVEY FINDINGS

1. 93% of the school districts included in the district narratives have Magnet programs. The smallest district reporting Magnets had 5,100 students enrolled in the school system (Montclair, New Jersey).
2. 59% of the districts offering open enrollment provide transportation to students.
3. With the exception of one district (Tulsa, Oklahoma), all districts having significant amounts of students utilizing open enrollment (greater then 10%) provide transportation.

4. All districts having greater than 15% of students exercising the open enrollment option are in urban settings.
5. Magnets were most likely found in urban settings.
6. All schools providing transportation to students exercising the open enrollment option were in urban settings (one was described as urban/suburban/rural, and five were described as urban/suburban.
7. 68% of the districts reporting Magnet programs state that they did so for desegregation purposes, either voluntary or court ordered.
8. It is possible for a school district to have open enrollment, diversity, and empowerment regardless of size. Districts in our survey which include all three components ranged in size from 5,100 students (Montclair, New Jersey) to 731,000 students (Los Angeles, California).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Schools of Choice as defined by PACE are a systematic interrelation of the three components of open enrollment, diversity, and empowerment. While these components can and do exist in isolation, they do not represent a powerful force for educational reform until they are recognized and combined in a systematic and programmatic approach.

Public school districts across the nation exhibit a vast array of isolated attempts at school improvement. These might include a classroom, a single school within the district, or a team within a building. While these are all admirable and do represent one or more of the components that PACE has identified, they do not harness the potent force represented by the implementation of all three components in a systematic and recognizable way. These isolated instances in many districts, however, do attest to the latent potential available to leaders in educational reform. Such potential may be found in Schools of Choice. Although PACE cannot offer one best model for school reform, we do submit our model as central to meaningful and lasting school improvement.

The components of our model of Schools of Choice can be, and have been, initiated in various ways. Some came about through administrative mandate, some from teachers who had a vision of a better way, and some through parent, community or government influence. The implementation has taken place with a variety of procedures, depending on the constituencies in the various communities. However, PACE has found that where the components of open enrollment, diversity, and empowerment are combined in a systematic way, the possibility of producing recognizably positive results is enhanced.

Open Enrollment

School districts across the nation reported that open enrollment is used primarily for desegregation purposes and that it is usually limited by race and sex. Furthermore, transportation is basically supplied only if the plan is a response to a desegregation attempt, either voluntary or under court order. Yet, those districts that have initiated an open enrollment plan within their borders report that often students who would have otherwise left the system are encouraged to remain because of choices made available to them. In contrast, districts that offer open enrollment without the presence of diversity, are impacted little because few students take advantage of the option. When programmatic diversity is lacking or limited, students make choices based on such non-educational variables as friendships, quality of neighborhood, or parent convenience.

Diversity

Diversity takes many forms. Magnet school programs are the most common form of diversity reported by school districts we surveyed. When program diversity is institutionalized, it recognizes that different instructional methods and subject

matter are essential to respond to the learning diversity that always exists in the student population. Districts with planned programmatic diversity report a need to carefully match students to programs. Counselors should aid students and parents in making choices that will realistically meet the needs and desires of their students. Furthermore, student choices need to be based on a thorough and timely knowledge of the options available. When pupils carefully select a program of interest there is evidence (standardized achievement tests and attendance) that achievement improves.

Empowerment

In the districts PACE visited, empowerment of teachers has not yet led to any radically different organizational structure. Instead, what has occured is a flattening or streamlining of the organization and a realignment of responsibilities. The districts that have empowered staff through site-base management have reported that time is an essential factor to be considered. Staff time spent on committees can be substantial. How a district addresses structured planning time can become a vital part in the success or failure of site-based management. Some districts provide release-time for committee work through the use of substitutes or flexible scheduling, while others depend on voluntary time. Obviously, use of substitutes would increase the cost of the program, but also might add to its longevity. Districts also report the need for good union-school board relations if site-based management is to become a reality, because many contract provisions come into question. While empowerment can be initiated from the top down or from a grass roots movement, it represents a substantial shift in power. Staff empowerment, to be successful, must be viewed as a sharing of power and not a taking or giving up of power. Most districts report that they are ready to have staff provide "input" to the decision-making process but have not yet empowered staff to make final decisions.

In the literature of today, empowerment generally refers to the building administration and staff. However, PACE proposes that the definition be extended to students, parents, and the community. Commitment to excellence by the total community will build a support base that is unbeatable. Empowerment will put a renewed emphasis on education which will raise the level of participation. This increased participation will then be acknowledged and recognized as important by the total community.

How districts define input can vary so widely that the term becomes clouded in personal opinions and experiences. It is interesting and useful to note that the interpretation of the value of input is viewed quite differently by teachers and administrators from within the same building much less the same district. District administrators often assessed the input they allowed teachers as being more comprehensive than how it was evaluated by the teachers.

After studying and observing many districts, PACE believes that empowerment is basic if diversity and open enrollment are to be meaningful and, furthermore, that empowerment will lead to planned diversity. Open enrollment is the means to access planned diversity and is a vital key if that diversity is to impact education in a powerful way.

PACE also found sporadic attempts at school improvement that could be developed into programs with significant impact if all three components of our model were recognized and organized into a systematic approach. For example, while open enrollment is being used in many districts as a desegregation tool, it is being overlooked as a more influential mechanism for the implementation of programmatic diversity.

In conclusion, PACE proposes that people concerned about educational excellence consider the systematic nature of the three components of Schools of Choice as a viable approach for education in the 21st century. On a very simplistic level, the model would consider that diversity could be likened to a car, with open enrollment as the wheels, and empowerment as the driver. With such a vehicle we can speed ahead on a flexible course to meet the demands of a changing terrain.

Chapter 2

Case Studies

PACE identified five school districts as representative of one or more elements of choice. We contacted leaders in each district and arranged for site visits in order to personally observe programs in action and to interview administrators, teachers, parents, and students. The following case studies are the results of our investigations. Less detailed examinations of 26 other districts are presented in the narratives section, beginning on page 33.

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

1450 NE Second Avenue, Miami, Florida 33132, (305) 376-1000
Contact: Dr. Gerald Dreyfuss, Assistant Superintendent, for School Based Management (305) 350-3097.

***Profile*: 255,000 + students urban/rural/suburban setting; 24 high schools, 48 middle/junior high schools, 178 elementary schools; 14,000 teachers, 259 building administrators, 1,200 central administrators.**

Dade County Public Schools is a school district that is representative of the empowerment and diversity portions of the PACE model of Schools of Choice. While the element of open enrollment is not totally missing within Dade's structure, it is limited to the magnet schools that operate within the system and a restricted number of approved curriculum transfers. Approximately 15,000 students exercise the open enrollment option. Because of Dade's interest in empowerment, PACE sent a team to visit schools that were involved in the pilot project on School Based Management/Shared Decision Making (SBM/SDM).

Magnet schools had been initiated as a response to a desegregation order. The district continues to monitor minority-to-majority transfers and minority staff percentages in various buildings. The schools participating in SBM/SDM may or may not be magnets. Whether a school houses a magnet program or not has no real impact on its participation in School Based Management.

The Dade County Public School System is located in southern Florida in the Greater Miami area. Dade County is about 2,000 square miles with an estimated 1987 population of 1.8 million. Greater

Miami is made up of 26 municipalities. Blacks represent 21% of the population, non-Hispanic whites about 36% and Hispanics about 44%. The non-Hispanic white population decreased by about 2% during the last five years. The Hispanic population increased within the same period by about 2% of the total population, while the black population was relatively stable at a modest 3% increase. The population numbers, therefore, reflect a steady increase of Hispanics. The unemployment rate in 1987 was 5.8%.

In the period between 1980-1987, the total population of Dade County increased by 10.7%. Some of this population increase was due to the population shifts from other states, but in southern Florida a large part was due to an increasing number of immigrants from the Caribbean, specifically Cuba and Central America.

The Dade County School System is a county unit and the fourth largest school system in the nation. The population of the schools is 23% white, 33% black, 43% Hispanic and 1% Asian/American Indian. The district is composed of students from over 100 different countries. School population has increased 8% since 1980.

The management of the schools is the responsibility of a seven-member school board that is elected by a county-wide vote. The school board, in turn, passes the responsibility for day-to-day management to the superintendent. The total revenue for the Dade County School System was $1.4 billion in 1987-88. Of the total budget, 6.7% was from Federal sources, 59.2% from the state of Florida and 34.1% was from local sources. The average expenditure per pupil in the Dade County School System was $3,268. The average teacher's salary was $30,000. The teacher/pupil ratio is 1:18. The biggest problems facing the district are expected population growth, lack of facilities to house growth, and ethnic diversity.

The idea of the building level having some discretionary power in budget decisions is not new in Dade County Public Schools. In 1972, the state legislature allowed school boards to give greater autonomy to individual schools. In the 1970's the school board took steps in this direction but turned down school based management in 1975. The concepts, however, continued to form seeds of thought in the minds of some district leaders. Following the Carnegie Report in 1985-86, these seeds began to flourish and a committee was formed to operationalize the concepts of School Based Management/Shared Decision Making (SBM/SDM).

According to Gerald O. Dreyfuss, Assistant Superintendent for School Based Management, SBM/SDM means decentralization to the site level where principals, teachers, parents, members of the community and others would be involved in improving education for the students at each school. This move was designed to flatten the administrative structure and to enhance the quality of education in accordance with the perceived needs of students. Such an administrative initiative needs teacher union support if it is to survive. Therefore, the major focus of the 1986 contract talks was the professionalization of teaching. Committees were established to review all aspects of the school based management proposal. These committees were made up of school principals as well as union stewards.

The pilot program, as recommended by the Teaching Task Force, was designed to include 32 participating schools. All 259 schools in the system were notified of the opportunity to apply.

In order to participate as a pilot school, each building had to submit a proposal that was acceptable to at least two-thirds of the faculty. It also had to include a shared decision making model that was designed by the school. The 32 K-12 participating schools were selected from 53 schools that submitted proposals. Selection of schools was made by a labor/management team of 10 people. An additional 11 schools were added in one all-black inner-city area as another way to test the concept. Many programs required waivers of system-wide policies by the school board and of contract provisions by the teachers' union. Participating schools requested over 100 waivers from the union contract, as well as other local and state regulations. All requests were granted.

The School Based Management/Shared Decision Making Program had seven goals:

1. An improved educational program for all students.
2. An increased focus of school district resources and increased Shared Decision Making and accountability at the school level.
3. Greater flexibility and responsibility in budget development and management at the school level.
4. Increased collegial planning, implementation, and evaluation of the instructional program.
5. Greater opportunities for flexible scheduling and staffing.
6. Increase teacher involvement in staff development activities.
7. Increased opportunities for community, business, student, and parent participation.

The PACE team visted four schools in order to understand the building level impact of SBM/SDM. The schools represent a cross section of economic areas as well as both elementary and middle/junior high school levels.

Olympia Heights Elementary School is located in a lower socio-economic area of Miami. The school population is more than 90% Hispanic. Enrollment in this school is growing. It is a Chapter One school staffed by 30 full time staff members.

The components of the proposal, as submitted by the staff of Olympia Heights, included the implementation of "quality circles", and focused in three areas:

1. Improvement of staff attendance.
2. Assumption of additional responsibilities by staff.
3. Superior achievement.

In addition, the proposal included the implemention of block scheduling, modification of the curriculum to impact bilingual and basic skills delivery, and improvement in computer-assisted instruction. Two non-instructional components were also listed. They included the development of a plan providing for preventive maintenance and upgrading energy conservation measures.

The philosophy of the school is based on the "quality circle" concept. There are three teams consisting of an office team, a staff team which includes the cafeteria staff, and a team composed of teachers only. The principal attends meetings only as a guest. The teams meet every two weeks to identify problems and work on solutions. Work done after the normal school day is paid as hourly salary or compensation time is given. Because of the work of these teams, office operations have been streamlined and curriculum improved.

The staff agreed that, by utilizing the "quality circles" approach, they would be able to modify delivery of bilingual and basic skills based upon a target analysis approach. This process would assist staff in identifying and developing innovative staffing procedures and curriculum improvements. Also, innovative techniques would be developed to enhance the use of audio-visual and computer-assisted instruction. The faculty at Olympia Heights believed that increased student use of computers would help bridge the gap between their students and those from more economically advantaged communities.

Teachers at Olympia Heights participate in interviews and hiring decisions for new staff members. However, by their own choice, they are not included in firing decisions.

Fuel conservation measures that were part of the original proposal have resulted in savings of allocated funds. Also, additional funds were saved due to the wellness program which resulted in reduced sick time and substitute usage. These savings were used to purchase sophisticated video equipment and to renovate a lounge for teachers as part of the wellness program. These serve as examples of how faculty decision making has impacted the budget and permitted transfer of funds to other items that the staff believes are important.

Henry H. Filer Junior High School is located in the lower socio-economic area of Hialeah, Florida. This school is a Grades 7-8-9 building that employs 70 full-time faculty. Hispanics comprise 87% of the school's population, while 12% of the students are black.

The proposal submitted by the staff of Filer Junior High School included plans to organize different grade levels into "casas" — houses — that would allow integrated delivery of instruction, guidance, and support services. They also proposed to extend time periods devoted to language arts and reading in grade 7. This would be done to reinforce communication skills and to improve standardized test scores. The proposal also included a peer evaluation component, and team planning periods to enhance interdisciplinary understanding and collegiality.

The "casa" concept in operation at Filer consisted of one casa for each grade level. Each casa was headed by an assistant principal who was responsible for the day-to-day operations. Casa principals report to the building principal as do other special services personnel. Each level has a different curriculum and its own guidance counselor. Inter-Casa Councils were established to facilitate shared decision making and to develop a peer evaluation component.

Seventh grade students at Filer have seven, fifty-minute periods per day instead of the traditional six, sixty-minute periods. They have an additional daily reading period, and have a choice of nine week electives selected from a range of classes such as visual arts, drama, graphics and woodworking. Included in the Casa Eight curriculum is a required career education/employability skills course. It provides an introduction for students to the world of work and introduces occupational planning for the future.

The ninth grade curriculum consists of the four required courses, two electives and reading as a required course similar to the pattern of a true first year of high school.

Cutler Ridge Elementary School is located in a middle/low socio-economic area of Dade County. The school population a 38% black and 15% Hispanic.

The main items in the proposal written by the Cutler Ridge staff were increased use of computers, implementation of an alternative class model, alternate scheduling of art, music, media, and physical education and implementation of "quality circles".

A computer lab was created in which children were taught to use the LOGO computer program. Computers were also being integrated into all disciplines to increase the students' awareness and of the value of computers in their learning environment.

An alternative class model is being used to help students believed to be "at risk" for success in school. These At-Risk-Classes (ARC) are limited in enrollment and can not contain Learning Disabled students or English as a Second Language students. Behavior problems are not included in the ARC unless there are other problems as well. An ARC is established at every level in grades 1-4. Next year, the faculty plans to add an ARC at grade 5 as well.

The structure that the staff decided to use for decision making was a Curriculum Council. Council meetings were open to anyone to attend but for voting purposes, the Curriculum Council consisted of six grade level chairpersons, one person each representing special education, special subject personnel, non-instructional personnel, parents and also the UTD steward and two department chairpersons. Information from the meetings was shared with all staff.

Goals for the school were decided in committees and a proposal was developed that encompassed the elements the staff believed were important for improving the educational standards at Cutler Ridge. When this staff was polled, about 76% of them agreed with the proposal. To date, the support has grown to about 88%.

The staff was enthusiastic about being included in the decisions made by the building. The problem associated with working in a site based managed school was providing enough time for the process to work. Cutler Ridge teachers chose not to include themselves in the peer evaluation component of the district model. They chose, rather, to serve in a supportive role to other teachers.

Cutler Ridge was also involved in another program initiated and encouraged by the Superintendent. It is the base for the Satellite Learning Center that is provided in cooperation with the American Bankers Insurance Group. This insurance company provides the building and maintenance while Dade County Schools provide the teacher and materials for a center that houses insurance company employee children through grade 2. This center has been a benefit to all involved. The school district gained some relief from overcrowding. In addition, integration is extended since the racial makeup of the program reflects the composition of the workplace and parents feel closer to their young children. Plans are being made to include other businesses in this same type of cooperative venture.

In line with the requirements of the district, Cutler Ridge is conducting formative evaluations on a yearly basis. In the computer lab, staff administers pre-and post-tests to measure competency and a survey to measure attitudes. In the At-Risk-Classes, they are measuring competency through the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, using the regular classes as a control group.

Southwood Junior High School is a magnet school, as well as a site based managed school. It is located in a middle/high socioeconomic area. It houses the South Center for the Arts magnet school. Students who enroll in the magnet must audition and be accepted. Southwood also has three Dade Partners. Dade Partners are businesses that give support to the schools. Southwood's partners are Florida International Bank, Southern Bell, and Bloomingdales. The racial composition at Southwood is 62% white, 24% black, and 12% Hispanic.

When the staff at Southwood wrote the proposal for inclusion as a site based pilot school they included provisions for: hourly personnel, exemption from requirements regarding surplus personnel, use of nonstate-adopted textbooks, and transportation for seventh and eighth grade students choosing an optional seventh period.

The decision making team at Southwood is called the Leadership Cadre. This Cadre is composed of 25 people. The members elected by the faculty were three members of the Faculty Council that had existed previously, three members of the existing Curriculum Council, nine members of the faculty at large and one full-time non-instructional staff member. The appointed members were the principal, one UTD building steward, chairpersons of language arts, math, science, and social studies from the Curriculum Council and three faculty members chosen by the administration to insure equality of representation on the Cadre. Each member of the Cadre is responsible to keep a group of teachers informed according to common planning periods. Southwood uses a self-nomination procedure to obtain candidates for the Cadre who are elected. If more than one person wants to serve in a certain capacity, then a vote is taken.

Department heads do evaluations at Southwood but only as a resource for teachers. Staff believed they were entitled to be evaluated by the administration. Some future goals at Southwood are to increase community participation in the shared decision making model, as well as more staff involvement in budgeting and staffing decisions.

Dade County Public Schools is using both summative and formative evaluation procedures over the three years of implementation of SBM/SDM. Each school in the pilot is required to design evaluation measures that match their stated objectives. The final summative evaluation is to be completed during the final year of implementation. In 1990, an external evaluation auditor will review the program. When the evaluation is complete the district will decide to expand, limit, or cancel SBM/SDM. Many schools are already asking to be included in the pilot, but no decision has been made in mid-1988 whether to expand the pilot or wait until the summative evaluation is completed.

Distinctive components of the Dade County System include the cooperation of the district and union in writing waivers to accommodate the various

proposals submitted by the participating schools, the peer evaluation system, satellite schools within the industry, and teaching academies that give teachers nine week sabbaticals to encourage research.

Problems and limitations facing Dade County Schools include a realization that effective implementation of a plan such as SBM/SDM requires a significant amount of time both in planning and in service on the part of the faculty and administration, facing skepticism by a portion of the staff that SBM/SDM is another passing fad, limited participation on the part of some members of the staff and combatting an unrealistic expectation on the part of participants and observers about the amount of time required to achieve positive results.

However, at this time, there is evidence of a growing enthusiasm on the part of teachers and administrators. They believe that what they do can make a difference in the lives of the students within their buildings. The individual plans for each building are unique to that building, not in the sense that the plan has never existed before in educational circles, but that it is a plan chosen by a faculty to meet a perceived need. The plans may vary, but enthusiasm is a constant across the schools PACE visited.

DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity

5057 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Michigan 48202, (313) 494-1000
Contact: Aretha Marshall, Executive Director of City Wide Schools and Programs (313) 494-1087.

***Profile*: 180,106 students, urban setting; 24 high schools, 59 middle schools, 164 elementary schools; 8,978 teachers, 809 central office/building administrators.**

Detroit, Michigan is a large industrial city with a student population of 180,106. Between 1970-80, the city experienced a 20.5% decline in population. Detroit not only experienced population shifts but economic shifts as well. High-paying jobs that required relatively lower levels of education became difficult to find. This decrease in population and employment was accompanied by a rapid change in population ethnicity that included a considerable increase in the percentage of minority population. The student population is currently 88.12% black. In an effort to meet the needs of its students, the administration of the Detroit Public Schools offer choices to their students in the form of Magnet schools, Alternative schools, and Specialty high schools.

In July, 1986 a Parental Choice Task Force consisting of 60 parents, community members, administrators, and teachers knowledgeable about existing schools of choice convened for the purpose of surveying current choices offered in the Detroit Public School System. The goal of this group was to produce a prioritized list of alternative programs the district should retain and make recommendations for Board consideration and action. The Task Force published an *Executive Summary, Recommendations, and Findings* in April, 1987 and a *Report of Parental Choice Task Force* in February, 1988. Both of these publications are available from the Detroit Public Schools. Another publication, *Schools of Choice Unique Educational Alternatives 1986/87* is a folder containing descriptive information on the specialty high schools, magnet middle schools, and alternative schools operating in Detroit. It was printed in response to a Task Force recommendation for more publicity for the choices offered in Detroit Public Schools. Much of the following information was taken from the above mentioned publications.

Schools of Choice are not new to Detroit. ***Cass Technical High School,*** with 3,100 students, has been a city-wide specialty high school since 1910. Cass Tech offers a number of curriculum areas to students who meet its admission requirements.

Since 1978, three other specialty high schools have opened. ***Davis Aerospace Technical High School*** was opened in 1986 and houses 350 students. It offers a four year program that is technologically oriented. ***King Senior High*** has been a-school-whithin-a-school since 1985 and has an enrollment of 300 students. Here, college bound students may select from three academic majors: mathematics, science, or applied technology. 95% of the 800 students who attend ***Renaissance High School*** go on to college. This high school opened in 1978. Entrance is based mainly on the applicant's achievement test scores. However, in addition to test

scores other criterion are considered when placing students. Each class must be no more than 60% of either sex, must be within 15% of the racial makeup of the city, and each area of the city must have at least 10 persons selected. Over 9,000 applications were received by Cass and Renaissance for 1,050 ninth grade seats available in September, 1987. Detroit neighborhood high schools have a dropout rate of as high as 45%, while the speciality high schools graduate 97%.

Detroit neighborhood high schools have an enrollment policy that enables students to transfer to other high schools in the city, if space is available. Students must provide their own transportation.

The Detroit Public School system has had a middle school magnet program in effect for more than 15 years. The schools were established by court order in December, 1970. The 1971 goal for middle school magnets was to provide "a racially-mixed middle grades program in at least one school in each of the eight regions which offer an experimental program which is educationally sound and hopefully superior to that offered in any other school in the region."

Initially the magnet middle schools were to be 50% black and 50% white. However, the racial distribution of the system has changed and now the magnet middle schools are mandated to reserve 30% of the openings for white students. After the close of the "open enrollment period" any unfilled seats may be given to other students.

The Parental Choice Task Force recommended that the eight magnet schools be maintained for several reasons. The magnet middle schools have achieved success in attracting students representative of all levels in the city. These students can be expected to perform on the average of at least a year above the city mean in reading and math on the California Achievement Test given in the beginning of eighth grade. From 60-99% of the students are bussed to school but costs for transportation are offset, in part, by state reimbursement, by lower facility costs, and by low security and vandalism costs.

Much to the disappointment of Detroit Public Schools, 45% of the graduates of the magnet middle schools attend high school elsewhere. Most of the students who leave transfer to area parochial high schools.

The Task Force has recommended that the number of magnet middle schools in Detroit be doubled. This recommendation was offered because there are waiting lists of about 300 students per school for the present facilities. The city has classroom space for this expansion. Current programs could be replicated or unique programs developed to meet this recommendation.

There are also four K-8 alternative schools. Each of the four K-8 alternative schools originated from a unique philosophic and educational orientation. Each has a mission statement expressing its view of education and a philosophy of how to work with children and their parents to accomplish a balanced educational program.

The K-8 alternative schools operate on standard budget allocations from the district. Class sizes are standard for the district—except the primary units in each of these schools, which are among the largest in the district. Costs are also kept down due to a variety of factors: no alternative school has a security guard, vandalism costs are low, and equipment and textbook replacement costs are negligible.

The students in alternative schools are representative of all racial, economic and achievement levels in the district. However, parents and students can expect that students attending these schools will perform on the average at least two years above the city mean in reading and math at the beginning of the eighth grade. This is true even if the student scored in the average range at the third grade level.

64% of the graduates of the K-8 alternative schools attend Detroit high schools and 78% of these enroll in the city-wide specialty high schools.

The Task Force has recommended that the K-8 alternative schools be replicated in other areas of the city. This is similar to their recommendation for increasing magnets. Hundreds of parents want to send their children to these alternative schools. Some parents are requested to do volunteer work for the school in order to keep their children's names on the waiting lists. The Task Force also believes that additional alternatives be established. These alternatives could be based on proven programs or unique schools designed by staff and/or parents. The Task Force has further recommended that when any school is reorganized, consideration should be given to making it an open enrollment school. When this happens the Task Force believes that first priority for application and selection should be given to the surrounding attendance area.

Members of the PACE group visited two of the alternative schools: Burton International and Detroit Open School.

Burton International School is one of the alternative schools offered to the children of Detroit. It has a kindergarten through eighth grade program that is open first to the neighborhood children and then to students from throughout the city. The school tries to maintain an ethnic and sexual balance. There are currently 534 students in attendance. Some walk to school, some ride a city bus and many are transported by carpool. The administration has attempted to keep it racially balanced with about 60% black and 40% white and others.

The building in which Burton International School is housed is old but well maintained. Both its exterior and interior are attractively painted with murals by Detroit artist Dennis Orlowski. Because the school is located in the inner city of Detroit, safety precautions such as grates on the windows and a locked steel door with an intercom are in evidence. However, once inside the school, one feels at ease in a friendly atmosphere. It is an example of how a good learning environment can be achieved regardless of the locale.

The pedagogical style of the school is fairly traditional. Students are grouped into classes or sections, and classrooms tend to have desks arranged in rows. Students are platooned so that a teacher has one group for a whole morning and another for the entire afternoon. The other half of the day is spent in special classes such as science, art, music, orchestra, computer lab, or language studies. Students start foreign language study in the third grade. For many students, English is a second language and so they may work in the language lab improving their understanding of the English language. The school stresses the importance of culture and ethnicity and uses the parents, teachers, and community as learning resources for the children. In the upper grades language arts is taught with a "whole language" approach fostering the use of language as a tool for learning.

Many of the teachers have applied for and received grants through various sources for expanding the experiences of the students, creating new curriculums, or enhancing the present curriculum.

Detroit Open School, another alternative, is located near the northern boundary of the city and draws its population from Region C in the northwest section of the city. From the outside, Detroit Open School looks quite traditional. The interior is well maintained and is brightly painted. Potted plants hang down the middle of the hall. Attractive bulletin boards display students' pictures and work. It was built as a traditional school. Classrooms have been personalized with tables, rugs, storage bins, and lofts. Though there are not enough chairs for all the students in some rooms, it is acceptable because students don't often use desks. If everyone needs to sit at the same time they usually use the carpet. The teachers use the hallways as extensions of their

classrooms, and because of the constant presence of between 1-4 parents in the room they do not have to worry about leaving their students unsupervised.

The Detroit Open School operates on the same budget as all the Detroit Public Schools. However, the parents contribute $12.00, or as much of that as they can afford, for "in house" field trips.

Class size in the building is also comparable to other Detroit schools. Kindergarten has 25 students, grades 1-2 have 28, and grades 3-8 have about 33 students in a class.

The philosophy of the school is directly based on the child-centered approach. They believe it is important to address the individual developmental needs of each child as espoused by Piaget. In order that parents may truly understand the philosophy and approach, they must spend a two hour scheduled visitation at the school before they are given an application. In addition, they must spend another two hours in volunteer work in order to have the application accepted for consideration. It is easiest to get into Kindergarten because there are 50 openings available each year. After that, prospective students must wait for vacancies. The child's name is maintained on the waiting list only if the parent is willing to do two hours of volunteer work per year. For a sibling to automatically enter the kindergarten, a parent has to volunteer 54 hours the previous year.

Detroit Open School has been in existence for 12 years, originally as a school-within-a-school and then as a separate entity. This program was supported by a school board member who wanted to start an alternative program at the elementary level in Detroit and by a dedicated teacher who became the program leader.

Alternative schools such as Burton International School and the Detroit Open School are examples of restructuring that appear to positively affect achievement scores and student success.

DISTRICT 4 — NEW YORK CITY

Choice Options: Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

319 E. 117th Street, New York, New York 10035; (212) 860-5911
Contact: Carlos Medina, Superintendent or John Falco, Assistant Superintendent of Alternative Schools.

Profile: 15,000 students, urban setting; 2 high schools in partnership with the Central Board of Education, 23 junior high schools, 16 elementary schools, 7 elementary bilingual schools, 16 alternative elementary schools, total of 52 schools in 21 buildings; 750 teachers, 69 building administrators, 28 central office administrators.

Located in an area of New York City known as Spanish Harlem, District 4 includes the area north of 96th Street to 120th Street from the East River to Central Park. It is among the poorest of New York City's 32 community school districts with more than 80% of its students coming from low-income backgrounds. The student population of about 15,000 is 65% Hispanic, 34% black, and 1% other. Unique among the city's community school districts, District 4 includes programs of open enrollment, diversity and empowerment.

The district's "choice" programs, based on the three premises above, began in 1973. It was then that the district ranked last among the 32 city school districts in reading scores, and approximately 10 of its 13,000 students were admitted to the city's specialty high schools. In the words of Deputy Superintendent Sy Fliegel, "Things couldn't get worse." Several teachers approached Superintendent Anthony Alvarado with alternative concepts for programs that they were convinced would work. Their goals were to raise achievement levels in basic curricular areas and to integrate neighborhood minority schools.

Because Federal dollars were unavailable to fund magnet schools aimed at integrating minority areas, and because Alvarado had little to lose, he gave the teachers the go ahead and three new schools were launched. Each contained two or three grades and fewer than 100 students. Classroom space was provided in existing school buildings, and the teachers who made the proposals were named as directors. Their responsibilities included recruiting teachers with a sense of mutual purpose and commitment, establishing policies, maintaining the school's philosophy, and managing its operation.

The schools begun in the early 1970s have grown. Started small, often with a single class or grade, they have expanded to a size of 90-250 students and, over the years, other alternative concept schools have developed. The method for increasing the number of alternative concept schools to the place where total choice was available remains virtually unchanged over the years. New programs are generally inititated by teaching professionals who see a need or possibility. Armed with a vision or philosophy for a new school, plus a several page proposal, a teacher describes the plan to district

administrators. If the plan is viable, a need is shown, resources are available, and the teacher has demonstrated the ability to be a good teacher or supervisor, the program is inititated. Schools begin small, with perhaps one grade level and two classes, and grow as demand requires and space allows.

Today, District 4 supports 52 programs housed in 20 school buildings. Deputy Superintendent Sy Fliegel likens the concept of housing several schools in a single building to an office complex where businesses function independently while sharing common areas. Each building is headed by a principal who has his/her own school and houses alternative schools. The principal's duties, in relation to the other schools, are managerial: coordinating use of common areas such as the cafeteria and gymnasium, overseeing building maintenance, facilitating communication among schools, and generally making certain that the building runs smoothly. These duties, however, do no overlap those of each school's director. The director and staff have autonomy in running their school. In fact, schools with varying philosophies and missions coexist side by side in most buildings.

All of the junior high schools are alternative concept or "choice" schools and neighborhood attendance boundaries no longer exist. Termed "free choice", this policy allows parents and students freedom to choose any junior high school within the district. In fact, students entering junior high school for the first time must make first, second, and third choices for schools they wish to attend. Every effort is made to place students where they want to be; first choice placement rates are over 50%. Once students enter a program, their places are secure from year to year although they may switch programs through the normal choice process.

In addition to total choice at the junior high level, five of the 21 elementary schools in District 4 provide alternative programs which students may opt to attend. At the elementary level, however, alternatives are limited because, according to Sy Fliegel, "Elementary schools tend to do a better job." Fliegel adds that there is currently very little space available for program expansion within the district at either the elementary or junior high levels. The high schools in New York City School District are centrally administered and District 4 has no jurisdiction over high school programming, except for two innovative high schools that they organized and developed. These are Manhattan Center for Science and Math and Central Park East Secondary School.

To attract students and satisfy their educational needs, District 4's Choice schools vary in their philosophies and curricular offerings. Some are highly structured while others offer an "open classroom" approach. A range of special needs and interests is addressed, from a supportive environment for students who display a consistent pattern of underachievement to programs designed for the academically gifted. Many schools offer an academic theme or area of emphasis including schools for human services, bio-medical studies, bilingual programs, a maritime school or those for humanities, math, and science.

A tour through the ***Alternative Education Center***, located on 109th Street, reveals four varied schools sharing a building which houses 800 students. The ***Talented and Gifted School*** (TAG) is a pre-kindergarten through grade 6 program providing an accelerated and enriched program for gifted students. Screened and tested before being admitted to the TAG School, these students move quickly through a traditional academic program leaving time in the day for various enrichment activities designed to challenge them. Sharing a building with junior high age students poses no problems according to the program director. In fact, she reports that the older children are protective of the younger ones, and serve as positive role models.

Downstairs, the ***Key School*** is a junior high program that accepts students by recommendation. Children who have trouble in traditional schools, who may be behavior problems, or considered in jeopardy because they may leave school, comprise the student body. Just 90 in number, the roll is kept

small so that teachers can concentrate on individualizing instruction, and building relationships with the students.

The ***Harbor Junior High School for the Performing Arts*** accepts students in grades 7-9. Enrollment is based on student choice followed by an interview to ascertain interest. The director emphasizes that it is interest, not proven ability, which is crucial to the staff in recruiting students. Harbor provides a traditional academic core of classes for students, as well as work in the areas of dance, drama, instrumental, vocal and circus arts. The performance arts area receives additional support from professional groups in or near the city. The school day is extended by 40 minutes to accommodate all student activities.

The ***East Harlem Career Academy*** has its own unique emphasis. In addition to its academic curriculum, the school provides opportunity for students to develop insight and understanding of the workplace. Learning practical skills, such as key boarding and speedwriting, is accompanied by visits to companies, colleges, and hospitals in order to help students focus on career goals.

Each school at the ***Alternative Education Complex*** is different from the others, and each attracts its own special students. Teachers at each school are committed to the program of the school and, therefore, are more likely to transfer that commitment to enthusiasm and energy in the classroom. According to the Deputy Superintendent, schools are given autonomy and function fairly independent of district control as long as they are successfully fulfillng their goals.

District 4's creation of small, autonomous programs, conceived through individual vision, illustrates an alternative approach to educational programming. Three important components of the district's educational design and structure for providing Schools of Choice are:

1. Empowerment/Ownership.
   Deputy Superintendent Fliegel stresses it is important to extend empowerment, which he prefers to call ownership, to all. School professionals design programs based on their visions of what schools should be. What they develop, they own. Given an array of choices, parents and children pick their school and, through that decision, develop ownership in the school.

2. Diversity.
   District 4 offers many choices based on the principle that diversity works only if quality is provided within the framework of choice. Competition for students among schools promotes that quality. Because a school will be eliminated if it cannot maintain sufficient enrollment, its programs must match student needs and interests.

3. Size.
   In District 4, school size is kept small by design to create a familial atmosphere. Such an atmosphere provides the nurture and care necessary for successful education and also encourages communication between both staff and families.

Open enrollment, diversity, and empowerment — all three are in place in District 4. Begun as a desperate experiment in the early '70s, it has evolved as a successful model. Several measures of success are offered by the district itself. Reading scores are now 18th out of the 32 community school districts, and about 64% of students read at or above grade level. Another measure of success is the number of students who are accepted to the city's specialty high schools: in 1973, 10 were admitted and in 1987, there were 260. Attendance rates are 88% at the elementary level and 82% at the junior high level. Finally, students from elsewhere are applying to attend District 4 schools. About 1,500 students who live outside the district are enrolled in its schools.

These students, according to the Deputy Superintendent, are middle class, working class, 85% minority, and 15% white. He goes on to say that if schools offer people quality education they will voluntarily integrate and will voluntarily travel to East Harlem.

FLINT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity

923 East Kearsley Street, Flint, Michigan 48502, (313) 762-1209
Contact: Nona Gibbs, Coordinator of Magnet Programs

***Profile*: 29,578 students, urban setting; 5 high schools, 4 middle/junior high schools, 3 elementary schools; 1,650 teachers, 89 building administrators, 73 central office administrators**

Flint is an example of a district that offers some choice to its parents and students. Its magnet program, a voluntary response to court ordered desegregation, has encouraged the development of diversity. For this reason, it has been selected as a case study.

The city of Flint is located about 65 miles northwest of Detroit and has a population of 149,000. For many years, Flint has been one of General Motors' largest automotive manufacturing centers. Recently, large layoffs have pushed the unemployment rate to the highest in the state. In Flint, 35% of those eligible for work are unemployed. According to Steve Nikoloff, Research Consultant for Flint Schools, 12,000 manufacturing jobs were lost last year. This translated to over $600 million taken from the local economy.

The second largest employer in Flint—the Flint Community School District, encompasses 30 square miles, and has watched its K-12 membership population decrease from 46,000 in 1968 to the current level of 29,578. Historically, the Flint Community Schools have been recognized for their pioneering of two major school concepts. First the idea of "community education" emerged in 1935 when the Flint Board of Education sought and received a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. The refinement of community education in Flint has served as a model for hundreds of communities across the nation. The second was Flint's early involvement in the magnet school concept. Magnets began to make limited open enrollment available, as well as some genuine diversity of program offerings.

In early 1975, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare charged that Flint was not in compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. According to Flint's *Magnet School Program a Review Part I,* HEW claimed that Flint Community Schools disproportionately assigned students and staff according to race, and that as a result of such assignments the district was not providing equal educational opportunity. The district was given 90 days to rectify what HEW considered to be an unlawful situation. Flint Community Schools reacted swiftly to the government's charges. After concluding in October, 1975, that the district was segregated, the Flint School Board wrote an open letter to the community stating the problem and asking for community advice and input regarding the solutions to these serious accusations. The community responded by attending 17 hours of hearings in January, 1976. At these meetings, 71 position

papers were presented, and 224 representatives from school groups and civic organizations stated their ideas regarding the segregation issue. The hearings resulted in support for the development of magnet programs that would end segregation voluntarily. A survey of Flint households showed that residents endorsed the development of voluntary methods to achieve desegregation by a 2 to 1 margin.

By March, 1976, a tentative plan was presented to community groups. After further refinement, the Voluntary Education Desegregation Plan was adopted on April 7, 1976. Two of the major components of this plan were:

1. Creation of 10 elementary magnets, seven senior high magnets, one K-12 magnet, and one 7-12 magnet school; and,

2. Providing free transportation to students electing to attend a magnet program.

Upon adoption of the program, the Flint Board of Education faced the task of program implementation. Foremost among the steps that had to be taken was staffing the magnets. This process began with descriptions of the magnet courses for teachers, who then indicated areas of interest. According to Nona Gibbs, Coordinator of the Magnet Programs for Flint Community Schools, an agreement was reached with the teachers' union that allowed the district to assign some high school teachers to magnet programs based on expertise rather than seniority.

Another important step was the development of a planning guide for implementation. This guide contained suggestions for developing program objectives, and also required the parental involvement. Finally curriculum and objectives were prepared. During the summer of 1976, a number of teachers and administrators spent 5,000 hours writing and developing the curriculum.

In a period of six months, the Flint schools achieved their task. The district put a voluntary desegregation plan into operation, and in the process, organized a magnet structure that included 19 new programs.

The magnet programs provided great diversity in academic offerings. For example, the ***Washington Elementary School*** is a-school-within-a-school, a regular self-contained elementary school coexists with a bilingual, multicultural magnet. This magnet is recommended for students whose first language is Spanish, have a Hispanic background, or non-Hispanic students who have an interest in learning Spanish and Hispanic culture. Students are encouraged to respect and appreciate racial, cultural, and linguistic differences. The students receive all basic subject instruction in English. Those students whose first language is Spanish are given the necessary skills to function in the classroom. They receive instruction in Spanish mainly to develop oral skills. Although a principal is the administrator of both programs at Washington, the magnet has its own full time facilitator who oversees its operation.

Doyle/Ryder Community Center houses a regular elementary school and one of the district's two magnets for the gifted and talented. The building is a prize-winning architectural blend of an old school with a magnificent atrium—styled new facility. This magnet is recommended for students who show high intellectual potential or show signs of being gifted.

Cook Academy employs a full time teacher who guides students in their study of French language and culture. A strong academic approach that stresses homework, firm discipline and a dress code are emphasized at this school. In addition to the French magnet, Cook Academy has teamed up with the Hurley Medical Center in Flint to offer health related programs and activities to children. This partnership enables the students to visit at least 10 different departments of the medical center each year to learn first hand about health education and the medical profession and is an example of Flint's participation in the National Adopt-A-School Program. Other magnets have developed working

relationships with Dupont Chemicals, the University of Michigan in Flint, and the Flint Journal.

According to the Flint Community Schools Program Guide, the staff at ***Martin Community School*** believes in "Developing responsibility and independence in children, which increases their confidence and feelings about themselves." They also "Strive to provide students with an environment where a desire to learn prevails." The Martin Community School attempts to achieve the above mission through the use of the Montessori teaching methods in grades K through 3. The Montessori trained teachers develop children's intellectual skills through sensory training. The other magnet at Martin Community School is instrumental music. Martin offers intensive and comprehensive music instruction that the staff believe will develop the child's self-confidence and responsibility.

In addition to the above magnet schools, Flint offers other magnet programs at the elementary level including: Continuous Read and Year Round School, Environmental Education, Global/Multicultural Education, Math/Science, Reading Plus, Creative Arts, Open School, Individually Guided Education, Using Shared Education in Health, and Technological Learning Center.

Programs at the Middle School level consist of Gifted Program, Fine Arts, French Foreign Language, Bilingual/Multicultural, and Flint Academy.

Senior High Magnets are comprised of Gifted/Talented, Auto Body Repair, Business Data Processing, Child Care Services, Fine Arts, Pre-engineering Math/Science, Plant and Building Maintenance, Accounting and Computing, Bilingual/Multicultural, Careers in Industry, Naval Junior ROTC, The Flint Academy, Graphic Arts, Welding, and Humanities.

For most magnet programs, student entrance is based on available space and maintaining an acceptable racial balance. Students may not add to the racial majority of the receiving school or take away from the minority of the home school. Other qualifications are necessary for the Flint Academy, the Gifted Programs, and specialized senior high programs.

Magnet school programs are funded through the operating budget and Federal Magnet Assistance Program. Per pupil spending for 1987-88 totalled $3,504.20. Of that amount $1,831.55 was local funding and $1,672.65 was state aid funding. This year $1,076,000 of the local operating budget was allocated to the elementary magnet school program. Additional magnet assistance money from the Federal Government in the amount of $2,056,000 has been received annually for the past two years. With the anticipated expiration of the magnet assistance funds at the end of next year, continued declining enrollments, and the highest unemployment rate in the state, the Flint School District enlisted a committee of community members to advise on closing some schools. In response to the committee recommendation, the district has decided to close one high school, two middle schools, and five elementary schools for the 1988-89 school year.

Steven V. Nikoloff considers the magnet schools successful because they are popular. "Nearly all of the magnet schools have long waiting lists," according to Nikoloff. This opinion is validated by the district's 1986 magnet program surveys. The Office of Program Evaluation conducted a survey research project to assess the opinions of various groups currently associated with magnets: parents of magnet students at all levels, secondary level magnet students, teachers in schools with magnet programs, and building administrators and counselors. The survey results and conclusions published in *Flint's Magnet School Program, A Review Part II,* March 1987, stated that each of the above four groups, "displays general approval of the magnets, including staff members not involved in magnets." The report also notes, "While approval of magnets is generally high and similar among groups, some students would like to see magnets refined, enhanced, and extended if possible. Staff concerns

focus on student enrollment, including procedures for selection and retention, so that students are matched with the appropriate program."

One need, expressed by parents, students and some staff, was for more publicity about magnets and renewed efforts to recruit students into the programs. The district has responded with the publication of a new parent-student magnet program guide and a substantial public relations and publicity promotion to insure that all students, parents, community, and staff in Flint become thoroughly familiar with the diverse opportunities which are made available through the magnet programs.

The following lessons from Flint's Magnet experience may be helpful to others desiring to create the diversity necessary to meet the differences in student and community needs, interests, and preferences.

1. Diversity in programming can be implemented in a relatively short period of time.

2. Parental involvement in the formative stages of program development pays a dividend in eventual parental support for diversification. When the district faced budget cuts, the community placed a high priority on retaining the magnet programs.

3. Although there is some question among the staff about the success of the voluntary desegregation aspects of the magnet programs, both teachers and parents agree the magnets should be expanded regardless of desegregation considerations.

4. Due to the turnover in the community and staff there needs to be a continuous promotion and education of both of these groups about choice options.

5. A position, similar to Flint's program facilitator at each school, helps to insure the smooth operation of diverse programs.

6. Partnerships with the corporate community enhance programs of diversification.

7. Some concessions between the Professional Teacher's Organization and the school district may be necessary to achieve the goals of diversity.

8. Counseling for students and parents should be available to help direct students to choose options that compliment their abilities and interests.

ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity

131 W. Broad Street, Rochester, New York, 14614, (716) 325-4560
Contact: Theodore De Soto, Team Leader, Restructuring

Profile: 32,000 students, urban setting; 7 high schools, 1 alternative high school, 1 junior high school, 5 middle schools, 1 6-12 School of the Arts, 36 elementary schools; 73 central office administrators, 225 building administrators, 2,400 teachers.

As a large urban school district, the City School District provides education for approximately 32,000 students in a city of 236,000 residents from varied ethnic, economic, and cultural backgrounds. Eight years ago, the traditional neighborhood school structure changed when magnet schools were first introduced as a voluntary means of desegregation. Current restructure of the district's schools provides for total open enrollment on the high school level. It is for this reason that a PACE team visited the district.

Choice is possible in Rochester because enrollment boundaries have been "opened". Students and their parents may choose from among traditional or magnet programs. Rochester uses the term "open enrollment" when students attend schools of their choice, other than magnets. Under the district's open enrollment policy for traditional programs, students must choose their school from within their resident quadrant. Magnet schools, however, offer city-wide choice. Academic and racial balance are constraints that limit open enrollment in both selections.

According to a history prepared by the Secondary School Restructuring Committee, there has been discussion for many years about restructuring possibilities within the Rochester City Schools, but few changes have occurred. In the earliest days, elementary schools housed students through grade nine. A junior high was opened in 1919, but closed in the early 1920's, because of high operating costs. Secondary schools then contained grades 7-12. In the late 1950's and early 1960's, parents lobbied for separate junior high schools, citing what they perceived as educational benefits.

However, by 1971, fears that junior highs would be used as a way to desegregate schools caused a plan for reorganization to be recinded. In 1981, another restructuring committee recommended both magnet and comprehensive junior highs. This plan, however, was derailed because of budget problems. Instead, former Superintendent Laval Wilson proposed, and the board adopted, a plan which was a compromise measure. Junior high clusters were formed within the high schools that did not have them.

The most recent effort to restructure city schools began in earnest in late 1985 with a recommendation contained in the *District Assessment and Proposed Mission Statement*, prepared by then Acting Superintendent Peter McWalters. His charge included a reexamination of the secondary

instructional organization, and a study of the advantages of creating a distinct junior high program separate from the senior high grades in structure, organization, facilities, and resources. A committee with equitable representation of parents, community members, central office staff, and school staff was organized to address the need to restructure secondary schools. Among the most critical issues to the district were the declining enrollment in the senior high schools, and the New York Regents Action Plan, which imposed additional requirements on junior high students beginning in the fall of 1986.

For example, at Franklin Senior High School on the district's northeast side, the grades 9-12 enrollment was 1,403 in 1982, but is projected to be down to 833 by 1989. According to the restructuring committee's report, a minimum of 1,000 students is necessary to "offer an adequate blend of required and elective courses." By 1989, only one of the six high schools was expected to meet that requirement.

The committee cited several problems that were caused by the decline in enrollment.

1. To maintain a minimum program at each school, some teachers were assigned very small classes. These occurred randomly, however, and not necessarily where small size was most beneficial to student learning. Staffing to maintain course availability required the addition of 30 teachers during a time when high school enrollment dropped by 2,000 students.

2. Schools were forced to offer many courses only one period during the day. "Uniques," as they were called, had reached 58% of the course offerings at one of the schools.

3. Opportunities at schools varied. Courses ranged from 94 at one school to 144 at another, so classes such as advanced placement and honors were not always available.

4. In some cases, classes were combined so that one teacher taught as many as three courses during one period in order to combine sufficient students to make up a class. In one, a physics teacher combined students in practical, general, and Regents physics.

The New York Regents Action Plan was another reason to consider restructuring. The additional course requirements at the seventh and eighth grade levels would require adjusting the length of the school day or the length of each period during the day. A proposed solution was "modular scheduling" where the day would be divided into 15 minute modules. Students could then be scheduled for both 30 minute language classes, and longer 45 minute English classes. This scheduling flexibility would leave room for the additional required course work. Coordinating modular scheduling at grades 7-8 with traditional scheduling at the upper level was difficult, however, since many junior high teachers taught one or more high school courses.

Three proposals resulted from the restructuring study. Presented to the Board of Education in May, 1987, they included: a plan to maintain the 7-12 structure, a plan which would house grades 7-8 separately from 9-12, and one which would group grades 6-8 separately from 9-12.

Each plan responded to the superintendent's 1985 assessment and mission statement, and was considered by the board. The plan calling for the establishment of grades 6-8 middle schools and high schools for grades 9-12 was adopted.

In the establishment of middle schools, the district stressed the desirability of a school environment that was sensitive to the physical, emotional, social and intellectual needs of students in transition from childhood to adolescence.

Two additional features of the plan adopted for both the middle and high school levels were the "house" organization and "home base guidance". Houses are small schools-within-schools of no more that 300 students. Each house has its own team of teachers, administrators, and support staff. Teachers

have common planning periods to discuss students, and prepare integrated instruction. Home base guidance is an advisor-advisee system. A teacher acts as an advisor to about 25 students, as well as serves as a link between home and school for their families. During a 30 minute per day home base contact, the home base guidance teacher reinforces, counsels, and guides that group of students.

During the 1988-89 school year, all high school students must choose the high school they will attend for the first time. Boundaries for attendance have been eliminated and students may choose from three comprehensive high schools offering a traditional range of course for either a local or Regent's diploma, or from 9 magnet programs.

Magnets provide specialty programs in a particular area of study. They are an alternative to traditional study, and are available to all students. Students at Magnet schools fulfill a core of traditional course work, but concentrate their studies in a certain area such as business, natural science, performing arts, technological preparation, or schools without walls. Magnets have been established to promote integration in the district, and were operating at elementary, junior, and senior high levels before the current restructuring program. Under this new plan, however, several magnet programs at the high school level have been added.

Many of the high school magnet programs are organized in a school-within-a-school format. For example, at Franklin there are four magnets. ***Benjamin Franklin High School*** is a comprehensive program offering traditional courses. Of the 504 seats available at this school, 167 have been filled through open enrollment. The ***Communication Arts Magnet*** at Franklin provides pre-professional course work and experience in journalism, public relations, advertising, film and video. This is a new magnet program, and as of this writing, 16 of 50 seats have been filled for the 1988-89 school year. Guided by local business leaders, the ***Business Magnet*** at Franklin incorporates up-to-date technology in developing the academic background needed for students either entering the workplace after graduation or being accepted at colleges in business fields. At this magnet, 78 of 130 seats have been filled. Finally, the ***Bio Science Academy***, which has enrolled 48 students of a potential 74, offers specialized biological environmental and health science courses, as well as internships at local hospitals, agencies and industries.

The Franklin schools are housed in the largest building in the district, which had a reputation for being a "poor school". In the past two years the school undertook "Project Redesign" in an effort to improve the school in several areas including: curriculum and instruction, administration and organization, building utilization, school environment, and parent and community relations.

Six out of 12 senior high programs are at capacity. Of high school students displaced by the creation of the three middle schools, about 96% in grades 9-10 received their first school choice and 4% their second. Of those in grades 10-11, first choice of school was received by 86%, while 11% were given their second choice.

District-wide the percentages were somewhat lower. Seventy percent received first choice and 7.5% second choice. These percentages take into account those students who, because they were not displaced from senior highs which were closed, were required to wait until requests from displaced students were first filled.

Pupil choice and space availability are not the only factors to consider for enrollment in magnet programs. In fact, the first sort criterion for enrollment in magnet schools is racial balance. This is established by using plus or minus 10% of the district's composition. Currently, 70% of the students are from a minority population.

The second sort criterion is designed to be certain that students representing all academic levels are accepted to magnet programs. To achieve this goal,

applications are monitored based on student standings on reading and math standardized test scores. Academic distribution is based upon a plus or minus 10% of the district's secondary composition.

Magnet school selection criteria are similar at the middle and elementary sschools. At the middle school level, students attend schools within neighborhood boundaries, unless they wish to attend a magnet program. With restructuring, four comprehensive middle schools were formed, with one in each quadrant of the school district. These schools provide equitable academic offerings, and are the schools the majority of middle school students attend. Five magnet schools are available at the middle school level including a bilingual academy, natural science magnet, and computer and technology magnet.

The elementary level provides for neighborhood schools of attendance, or an open enrollment policy that offers students the opportunity to attend any school within quadrants established by the board. They are eligible for transfer from one school to another according to race and available space within the building. The district maintains an options chart for each school year defining which schools are open for transfers from minority and non-minority children. Transfers may not affect the racial balance of a student's neighborhood school, and must promote desegregation in the receiving school. Also available to elementary students are magnets that provide instruction in performing arts, oral language, communications, science, and a language immersion program. Approximately 1,800 students, or 10% of the total number of elementary students, participate by choice in magnet programs, while about 900 students or 5% participate in open enrollment.

Concurrent with the restructuring effort, the district and Rochester's teachers' union ratified a contract with several new features. Benefits to teachers were balanced by new demands placed upon them. Teacher salaries will increase significantly over the term of the 3-year contract. Average pay for an experienced teacher will rise by about 40 percent. By the final year, 1989-90, lead teachers, a new category created by the contract, could earn nearly $70,000.

During the course of the contract, teachers will no longer receive automatic step increases for experience and education which are typical in teacher salary schedules. Instead, a four step "Career in Teaching Plan" replaced the 26-step salary schedule. Four categories: intern, resident, professional and lead teacher are defined. Lead teacher is a competitive level for teachers with at least 10 years experience. Their responsibilities will include at least 50% classroom teaching, as well as time on special instruction-related or profession-related assignments. A joint Governing Panel co-chaired by the superintendent and the president of the Teachers' Association is being formed with equal representation from the district and the association, who will implement this plan. Lead teachers will be in place for the 1988-89 school year.

The current teacher contract is also designed to encourage the growth of empowerment through its school based planning program. According to the superintendent and union president, the committees are intended to enable each school to develop its own character and direction. Although school based planning committees are scheduled to be functional in the fall of 1988, district personnel are, as yet, uncertain of their composition, function or direction. Contract language defines neither the scope of influence, nor mission of such committees. The opportunity remains open for each school to use school based planning in a unique manner.

One function the committees may assume is the monitoring of voluntary transfer procedures. Under the new contract, seniority has been eliminated as a determining factor in voluntary transfers. Instead, "a building based screening committee" will review and approve all such transfers.

Additional provisions of the contract include teachers working a longer school year — a year of 190 days by contract's end. Also, at the secondary level, teachers will assume "home base guidance" responsibilities requiring them to develop and maintain contacts with a class-size group of students and their families. This program is an effort to personalize education and provide consistent, supportive contact between teacher and student.

Rochester City School District's most obvious change is the restructure of its secondary configuration. In the restructuring process lies promise for development of "schools of choice" where all three elements: open enrollment, diversity, and empowerment are present. The current teacher contract, which provides for school base planning committees, may be a critical factor in enabling development of empowerment and diversity. Such committees represent the possibility of change at the building level in such areas as development of school philosophy and mission, improving school climate, creating instructional programs responsive to student needs, staffing, and professional development. Empowerment, or ownership of decisions, could be a direct outcome of such work. Likewise, increased diversity could be a result of staffs directly assessing instructional needs, and responding to them programatically.

Chapter 3

Narratives of Other School Districts

BEND-LAPINE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Choice Options: Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

520 N.W. Wall Street, Bend, Oregon 97701, (503) 385-5201
Contact: Al Frickey, Assistant Superintendent

Profile: 7,700 students, rural setting; 3 high schools, 2 middle/junior high schools, 7 elementary schools; 442 teachers, 19 building administrators, 9 central office administrators.

The Bend-Lapine School District, through school board policy, provides open enrollment for all grades. The school of attendance is a choice made by parents and students on a "space available" basis for reasons of curriculum focus or parent convenience. Approximately 3.9% exercised their open enrollment option during the 1987-88 school year. The school district does not provide transportation for students who are enrolled outside of their designated attendance boundaries.

Diversity has been in existence between 5-25 years depending on the program. At the high school level there is alternative education. At all three levels, the district offers Magnet schools and gifted and talented programs. Program implementation in Bend-Lapine includes one year of research and planning, one year of piloting, and then program implementation if the evaluation is favorable. School officials state that, "The schools belong to the patrons", "competition between schools is healthy", "different staffs have different strengths", and "students perform better when they buy into their environment".

The Bend-Lapine Public Schools empower their professional staff in goal setting, policy writing, procedural management decisions, professional growth decisions, definition of curriculum and selection of textbooks and instructional materials.

CHATTANOOGA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity

5705 Middle Valley Pike, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37343, (615) 825-7200

Contact: Dr. Clifford Hendrix, Deputy Superintendent

Profile: 23,000 students, urban setting; 7 high schools, 11 middle/junior high schools, 34 elementary schools; 1,300 teachers, 103 building administrators, 38 central office administrators.

The Chattanooga Public Schools have an open enrollment policy that is limited to one K-12 Magnet school, the Chattanooga School for Arts and Sciences. The school, in its fourth year of operation, will educate 4.3% of the student population, who have been selected from district wide applications. The Chattanooga School for the Arts and Sciences was initiated by a local foundation with a strong interest in education, and offers limited diversity to the district. This diversity was implemented to initiate change and create some choices. Transportation is the responsibility of the students selected to attend.

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity

238 E. 9th Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202,
(513) 369-4093
Contact: Dr. Barbadora, Director, Planning, Research and Evaluation

Profile: 53,000 students, urban setting; 9 high schools, 10 middle/junior high schools, 59 elementary schools; 3,429 teachers, 135 building administrators, 75 central office administrators.

The Cincinnati Public Schools have an open enrollment policy. Students and parents may elect to attend a school outside their normal enrollment boundaries. Though available at all levels, the students must meet the specific qualifications of the school involved and the selection should aid in the racial balance of the school community. This choice, based primarily on the curriculum or the teaching techniques and philosophy of the school, could also be determined by parental convenience or co/extra-curricular interests. The school district provides transportation to 35% of the school population who exercise this option.

The school system is diversified. Alternative education (ranging from schools for performing arts to vocational schools), Magnet schools and schools-within-a-school have been in existence for 15 years at all levels. The gifted and talented programs are well established at all levels. Thematic schools and Montessori education is available at the elementary level. This diversification, approaching 100% of the school buildings in Cincinnati, is a result of community, faculty, administration and school board action to meet the students needs and to provide alternatives for the entire school population.

COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity

1818 West Worley, Columbia, Missouri 65203,
(314) 445-8541
Contact: Dr. Christopher Mallory, Administrative Assistant

Profile: 12,000 students, urban setting ; 2 high schools, 3 middle/junior high schools, 16 elementary schools; 800 teachers, 37 building administrators, 18 central office administrators.

Columbia's open enrollment policy is limited to one elementary school, with some minimal availability to high school students. For the 1987-88 school year, 2% of Columbia's student population exercised their open enrollment option. Choice to attend schools can be based on philosophy and teaching techniques of the school or course and program availability.

Programmatic diversity exists primarily at the elementary level, and some programs have been in existence for as long as 20 years. At the elementary level, there is a Magnet school. At the secondary level there is alternative education. Establishment of planned diversity is a cooperative effort of the school board, parents, community members, students, faculty, and building administration.

DES MOINES INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

1800 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa 50306, (515) 242-7771
Contact: Dr. James Bowman, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction

Profile: 30,600 students, urban setting; 8 high schools, 11 middle/junior high schools, 41 elementary schools; 2,200 teachers, 87 building administrators, 35 central office administrators.

The Des Moines Independent School District's open enrollment policy is based on the availability of classroom space, need, and effect on minority/non-minority ratio. At present, 4.4% of the students exercise their open enrollment option. The district does not provide transportation to these students.

Diversity has been in operation in Des Moines for 15 years. At the elementary level, there are Magnet schools. At the high school level, there are schools-within-schools. At the middle/junior high school levels, there is an alternative eduction program. At all levels, there are gifted and talented programs. Responsibility for this diversity rests with the central office and building administrators.

The professional staff can make final decisions regarding the disposition of building funds, staff scheduling and assignments, and the use of non-instructional staff time. Teachers actively participate in district policy development and planning. In addition there are more than 100 advisory committees functioning with staff, parent, student, and administration members.

EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH SCHOOL SYSTEM

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment Diversity, Empowerment

P.O. Box 2950, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70812, (504) 922-5400
Contact: Mary Ellen Jordan, Coordinator of School Redesign, (504) 922-5449

***Profile*: 58,000 students, urban/suburban/rural setting; 17 high schools, 15 middle schools, 63 elementary schools; 3500 teachers, 165 building administrators, 10 central office administrators for instruction.**

East Baton Rouge School District is initiating a policy of school-based management in 12 pilot schools for the 1988-89 school year. These 12 schools were selected by the school board from a list of 25 suggested by the central administration. It is the district's intention that within a five-year period all schools will be site-managed.

East Baton Rouge's School Redesign is a proactive response by central administration to a desegregation plan that was implemented eight years ago by court order. Initially, the Redesign Plan will function within the framework of the court order. According to the district, "During this pilot year, all students will not be able to transfer to or from a pilot school because of the mandates of the Federal Court Desegregation Order. Eligibility is determined by the parish-wide enrollment ratio." Even with taking this into account, 6.5% of the pilot schools' population will be determined by reassignment during this first year of the program. District officials believe that eventually the new Redesign Plan will lead to voluntary desegregation.

The Redesign Plan states that an Advisory Council must be established in every site-based managed school. This Advisory Council is responsible for developing an Action Plan based on the needs of the school. Action Plans are submitted to the

superintendent for approval and then to the Oversight Committee for review. Audit Committees will visit each school to evaluate program effectiveness. Furthermore, the Advisory Council will make recommendations for disposition of building funds and the hiring of staff.

Before the Redesign Plan was implemented, the programmatic diversity within the Baton Rouge School District consisted mainly of seven Magnet schools. Admittance to these Magnets was based on grade point average and race. With the Redesign Plan, these Magnets will remain unchanged. However, in addition, each of the site-based managed schools will now offer enhancements that will involve an emphasis on a variety of interests.

FORT WORTH INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

3210 West Lancaster, Fort Worth, Texas 76107, (817) 926-5463
Contact: Larry B. Barnes, Vice Principal and Coordinator

***Profile*: 67,000 students, urban setting; 12 high schools, 18 middle/junior high schools, 62 elementary schools; 3634 teachers, 182 building administrators, 116 central office administrators**

The Fort Worth Independent School District has an open enrollment policy. Students at all grade levels may attend the Magnet school of their choice within the limitations of court-ordered desegregation. The district provides transportation, and currently 3.6% of the students exercise this option.

At the elementary level, diversity is present in a Magnet Montessori program. At the secondary level there is an Essential High School. In addition, there are Magnet schools for finance, engineering, medicine and an International Baccalaureate program.

SCHOOL CITY OF HAMMOND

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment

41 Williams Street, Hammond, Indiana 46320-1948, (219) 933-2400
Contact: Dr. David O. Dickson, Superintendent

***Profile*: 13,600 students, urban setting; 4 high schools, 1 career center, 5 middle/junior high schools, 18 elementary schools; 920 teachers, 70 administrators**

The School City of Hammond uses open enrollment to improve the racial balance in the district. This option is available to all students at all grade levels. Applications are processed in the order in which they are received. Parents assume transportation responsibilities.

In the Hammond Public Schools, some diverse programs are being explored and may be implemented as a result of the School Improvement Process.

Empowerment of the staff in Hammond is a direct result of the School Improvement Process (SIP). Its philosophy, successes and failures are well documented in various newspapers, professional journals, and other publications. Students, parents, and teachers in Hammond have decision making power to shape educational programs that they believe will be best suited to their buildings. Additionally, decisions in curriculum planning and development, instructional strategies, staffing needs and hiring, professional development, disciplinary procedures and scheduling are now made by teachers and administrators working together with parents and students on SIP teams.

HOLYOKE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity

98 Suffolk Street, Holyoke, Massachusetts 01040, (413) 534-2007
Contact: Robert O'Neill, Director of Parent Information

***Profile*: 7060 students, urban setting; 2 high schools, 2 middle/junior high schools, 11 elementary schools; 750 teachers, 30 building administrators, 15 central office administrators**

Holyoke's open enrollment policy focuses on a voluntary desegregation plan developed prior to court order. Science, early childhood, writing and literature Magnet schools were implemented to balance schools racially. Due to continued success, the Magnet option now attracts 10% of the elementary school population. The choice of schools is not limited to the elementary level, although the most significant options occur at that level. The school district provides transportation for these students.

HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

3830 Richmond Avenue, Houston, Texas 77027, (713) 623-5011
Contact: Joseph Drayton, Director of Public Relations

***Profile*: 191,500 students, urban setting; 25 high schools, 33 middle/junior high schools, 166 elementary schools; 10,000 teachers, 233 building administrators, 80 central office administrators**

Students in the Houston Independent School District may attend a school outside of their own enrollment/attendance boundaries as a result of court-ordered desegregation. The choice of schools, an option elected by 32% of the population, is based upon the focus of the curriculum, philosophy and teaching techniques, or parental convenience.

Houston has programmatic diversity at all levels. The district has offered Magnet schools, schools-within-schools, alternative education, and gifted and talented programs for over 10 years. This planned diversity has been a result of a cooperative effort of the school board, building administration, faculty, parents, community members, and students.

Teacher empowerment is limited to disposition of building funds, staff scheduling and assignments, and textbook selection.

INDIANAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

120 E. Walnut Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204, (317) 266-4405
Contact: Wayne H. Kincaid, Assistant Superintendent

***Profile*: 50,437 students, urban setting; 7 high schools, 10 middle/junior high schools, 68 elementary schools; 3152 teachers, 263 building administrators, 65 central office administrators**

The Indianapolis Public Schools' open enrollment policy permits students at all grade levels to attend a school outside of their own enrollment/attendance boundaries. This policy, based on a 1981 court order to desegregate, is limited to those students who will help aid in achieving a racial balance in the schools. The choice of schools is an option selected by approximately 10% of the student population. The school district provides transportation to those students exercising this choice.

Diversity within the Indianapolis Public Schools has been present for over 10 years. Developed with community based planning and school board approval, the schools are designed to meet the educational and cultural aspirations of a diverse population. The option programs in the elementary schools and the Magnet programs at the secondary level are designed to give parents a choice in the style of learning and teaching environment they feel is best suited for the student. The schools receive many applications because students perform above the national average.

The professional staff actively participates in the school district's policy development and planning. Schools develop their own proposals and plans, and request funds to meet the needs of their "at risk" students. Empowerment of the professional staff is limited to the disposition of building funds, staff scheduling and the utilization of non-instructional staff time.

JACKSON PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

P.O. Box 2338, Jackson, Mississippi 39205, (601) 960-8730
Contact: H.L. Allen, Administrative Assistant

***Profile*: 33,050 students, urban setting; 8 high schools, 11 middle/junior high schools, 37 elementary schools; 1928 teachers, 91 building administrators, 65 central office administrators**

Jackson Public School's open enrollment policy allows students at all grade levels to choose a school outside of their own enrollment/attendance boundaries. Transportation is provided to those students who exercise this option.

Programmatic diversity was implemented in the Jackson Schools through the interest and support of parents, community leaders and the Chamber of Commerce. Diversity is evident through Magnet schools, thematic schools, and gifted and talented programs which have been in existence at all levels for over eight years.

The professional staff participates in the policy development and planning through shared decision making processes at both the district and building levels.

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI SCHOOL DISTRICT

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

1211 McGee Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106
Contact: Dr. Ronald Simpson, Director of School Management

***Profile*: 34,500 students, urban/suburban setting; 11 high schools, 11 middle schools, 53 elementary schools; 2800 teachers**

The School District of Kansas City, Missouri, has an open enrollment policy that allows any student, regardless of residence, to attend a Magnet school. Students are admitted on a first-come, first-served basis, within guidelines to improve racial balance. A preference is given to those students continuing in a program that was begun in the lower grades. The Magnet school program was Kansas City's response to an order of the court. There is no open enrollment for non-magnet schools.

Diversity exists in the Kansas City School District through that extensive Magnet school program. 44% of the district's schools have Magnet themes, and it is expected that 43% of the city's school population will participate in the program at the elementary, middle, and high school levels during the 1988-89 school year. There is a continuity of themes at all school levels, thus creating feeder schools. The extensive Magnet themes, either already operational or proposed, include:

- Computers Unlimited
- Communication & Writing
- Environmental & Writing
- Foreign Language
- Classical Greek
- Science/Math
- Visual & Performing Arts
- Engineering & Technology
- Law & Public Service
- R.O.T.C.
- Agribusiness
- Business Technology
- Advanced Vocational & Technical
- International Studies
- Health Professions
- Montessori Elementary
- Gifted & Talented
- Latin Grammar

Teachers are involved in planning for the Magnet themes through their participation in Site Planning Committees. This group plans the direction and curriculum of a particular Magnet. School budgets are created within specified guidelines and are dependent upon the nature of the program, but

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment

450 N. Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90012, (213) 625-6040
Contact: Lorna Round, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction

***Profile*: 731,340 students, urban setting; 49 high schools, 72 middle/junior high schools, 411 elementary schools; 28,885 teachers, 1,421 building administrators, 477 central office administrators**

The Los Angeles Unified School District has an open enrollment policy enabling students at all levels to select schools outside of their enrollment boundaries. This policy was initiated by the district as a response to court-ordered desegregation. Choice of school may depend on focus, philosophy, teaching techniques, or the quality of the neighborhood. The school district does provide transportation to the 3.6% of the student population that exercises the open enrollment option.

Programmatic diversity has existed in the Los Angeles Unified School District for over 20 years. Program changes were a result of court order, overcrowding, community and parental involvement,

and student needs. The 67 Magnet schools report successes in academic achievement and desegregation.

The staff is empowered in the areas of scheduling and assignments, use of non-instructional staff time, and textbook selection. The professional staff participates in district policy development and planning.

MONTCLAIR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

27 Valley Road, Montclair, New Jersey 07042, (201) 783-4000
Contact: Judith Wilcox, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction

***Profile*: 5141 students, urban setting; 1 high school, 2 middle/junior high schools, 6 elementary schools; 403 teachers, 18 building administrators, 12 central office administrators**

Montclair's open enrollment policy was established in 1977 to meet desegregation mandates. All elementary and middle school students participate in the Magnet plan by enrolling in the school of their choice. Parents may choose to send their children to any elementary or middle school in the district. They may select a school based on the interests and abilities of their children, the focus of the curriculum, or the philosophy and teaching techniques of the school. A child's attendance, however must not disturb the racial balance or create overcrowding in a particular school. Transportation is available for students who live within the mileage limits set by board policy.

Some of Montclair's schools have been in existence for more than 10 years. The original Magnet plan had included gifted and talented, fundamental, and primary unit programs. In the past five years science and technology, international studies, basic arts and Montessori programs have been added. All schools follow the same core curriculum in reading, writing, mathematics, social studies and science, but each Magnet has its own specialized theme and organization. In addition to the Magnets, there are schools-within-schools, alternative education, and thematic schools. Establishment of planned diversity is the result of a cooperative effort of school board, parents, community members, students, faculty, and building administration.

Montclair places a strong emphasis on teacher participation in the decision-making process. The professional staff is involved in the disposition of funds, hiring of building staff, staff scheduling and assignments, utilization of non-instructional time, curriculum and textbook selection. They also actively participate in district policy development and planning.

PINELLAS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

P.O. Box 4688, Clearwater, Florida 34618, (813) 442-1171
Contact: Allen L. Mortimer, Director of Research and Planning

***Profile*: 89,849 students, urban setting; 15 high schools, 21 middle/junior high schools, 74 elementary schools; 5025 teachers, 316 building administrators, 164 central office administrators**

Programmatic diversity is present in Pinellas County at the high school level through Magnet schools. Programs are available in the areas of computer technology, artistically talented, and academically talented. These diverse programs have been in existence for four years. Though any student may apply to the Magnet schools through a special attendance permit, acceptance is limited based on a court ordered desegregation plan.

The staff at Pinellas County is empowered to make decisions at the building level regarding disposition of building funds, hiring of staff, utilizing of non-instructional time, and staff scheduling and assignments. Teachers participate in committees such as curriculum, program development, and evaluation of programs and departments.

PRINCE GEORGE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity

14201 School Lane, Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772, (301) 952-6000
Contact: Bonnie Jenkins, Supervisor of Public Affairs and Communication

***Profile*: 103,300 students, county setting; 20 high schools, 27 middle/junior high schools, 112 elementary schools; 6000 faculty/building administrators**

The Prince George County School District offers open enrollment to all students as a result of court-ordered desegregation. Parents and students may choose the school of attendance and the administration approves the choice as long as the required racial mix is not upset. Choice of school is available at all grade levels and is usually based on the focus of the curriculum. This past school year, 11.4% of the students exercised their choice option. The district does provide transportation.

Programmatic diversity in the Prince George County School District is evident in its extensive Magnet program. Choices available include but are not limited to Work Place Magnets for day-care, French Immersion programs beginning in Kindergarten, a Japanese high school, a Creative and Performing Arts program (K-12), and Army and Air Force ROTC programs at the high school level. In addition, there is a one-half day Montessori program for three to six year olds. Community members, administration, parents, school board members, and faculty are all responsible for this planned program diversity.

RACINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

2220 Northwestern Avenue, Racine, Wisconsin 53403, (414) 631-7171
Contact: Sandra Hart, Information Officer

***Profile*: 21,000 students, urban/surburban setting; 4 high schools, 6 middle/junior high schools, 24 elementary schools; 1400 teachers, 55 building administrators, 51 central office administrators**

The Racine Unified School District has open enrollment available to all students. The school the students attend may be determined by parents, the students themselves, or the administration. The choice of schools is based on the focus of the curriculum, the philosophy and teaching techniques of the school, student friendship or parental convenience. The school district provides transportation to the 2% of students who attend schools outside of their enrollment/attendance boundaries.

Diverse programs in Racine are available through Magnet schools at all levels. In addition, there are schools-within-schools at the elementary and middle/junior high school level, and alternative education at the middle/junior high level. These programs have been in operation for up to 16 years.

The professional staff decides on the disposition of building funds, staff scheduling and assignments, textbook selection and the utilization of non-instructional staff time.

SAN DIEGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity

41200 Normal Street, San Diego, CA 92103, (619) 293-8034
Contact: Bertha O. Pendleton, Deputy Superintendent

***Profile*: 112,000 students, urban setting; 107 Elementary Schools, 18 Middle Schools, 15 Senior High Schools, 10 Special Schools and facilities, 42 Magnet schools; 21 of the elementary schools and one middle school operate on year-round multiple or single track schedules (45-15)**

The Voluntary Ethnic Enrollment Program (VEEP) has been operating since 1967. About 6% of the students participate by enrolling in schools where their racial/ethnic group is unrepresented. The minority groups consist of Hispanic, black, Asian, Indian, Eskimo, and Polynesian. The majority groups include white and Portuguese.

The Magnet programs were set up for voluntary desegregation in 1965. About 30% of the students participate in the Magnet programs. While the curriculum at non-Magnet schools is standardized throughout the district and is directed by the state curriculum mandates, the curriculum and focus of the Magnets is chosen by a committee of 12 members from each building. A typical committee consists of four central office administrators, two community members, one principal, and five teachers. The teachers have significant input but are limited by state guidelines. The principal and central office have the final approval on curriculum matters. Staff from Magnet schools have voluntarily agreed to extend the school day an extra hour to accommodate the program if necessary. This is done without extra pay. The Magnet coordinator receives a small stipend.

The Magnet buildings receive additional funding. Teachers may request special equipment. Any teacher who has four years of district seniority is eligible to apply for a position in a Magnet building.

SAN JOSE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

1605 Park Avenue, San Jose California 95216, (408) 998-7817
Contact: Dr. Jim Baughman, Deputy Superintendent

Profile: 29,000 students, urban/suburban setting; 7 high schools, 7 middle/junior high schools, 25 elementary schools; 1790 teachers, 103 building administrators, 35 central office administrators.

San Jose's open enrollment policy, although offering a wide variety of opportunities, has a primary focus of meeting court-ordered desegregation. Open enrollment is not available to all students, but is extended across all levels. The decision of which school to attend may be determined by parents, students, or administration. Students may choose to attend a school because of focus of the curriculum, philosophy and teaching techniques of the school, quality of the neighborhood, student friendships, parent convenience, or co/extra-curricular interests. San Jose provides transportation for those students exercising their open enrollment option.

Magnet schools, schools-within-schools, thematic schools, and gifted and talented programs are offered at all levels. This planned diversity was implemented through the cooperative efforts of the school board, parents, community members, students, faculty, and building administration.

Teacher empowerment is extended to the area of disposition of building funds, hiring or building staff, scheduling and assignments, and utilization of non-instructional time. In addition, the professional staff participates in district policy development and planning.

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Choice Options: Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

815 4th Avenue North, Seattle, Washington 98109, (206) 281-6700
Contact: Donna Dunning, Public Relations Director

Profile: 44,000 students, urban setting; 10 high schools, 10 middle/junior high schools, 66 elementary schools; 2700 teachers, 125 building administrators, 70 central office administrators.

As of the 1987-88 school year, 16% of Seattle's student population exercised an open enrollment option. Option programs are determined by administration, parents, and students, and are available at all three levels. Decisions for choosing schools can be based on focus of the curriculum, philosophy and teaching techniques of the school, student friendships, quality of the neighborhood, parent convenience, and co/extra-curricular interests. Transportation is provided to students exercising the open enrollment option.

Seattle has diverse program offerings, some of which have been in existence as long as 21 years. Across all levels there are Magnet schools and thematic schools. In addition, there are schools-within-schools at the elementary level. Establishment of planned diversity is the result of a cooperative effort of the school board, parents, community leaders, students, faculty, and building admininstration.

The professional staff has the final decision making power for disposition of building funds, hiring of building staff, staff scheduling and assignments, utilization of non-instructional time, and textbook selection. The staff participates in district development and planning.

ST. PAUL PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity

360 Colborne, St. Paul, Minnesota 55102, (612) 293-5144
Contact: Dr. David Faye, Assistant Superintendent

Profile: 32,000 students, urban setting; 8 high schools, 8 middle/junior high schools, 35 elementary schools; 1800 teachers, 90 building administrators, 37 central office administrators.

The St. Paul Schools' open enrollment policy permits students and parents to choose the elementary or secondary school of their choice. Begun as a response to parent requests and to a desegregation court order, this policy enables the students to choose their school based on the focus of curriculum, the philosophy and teaching techniques of the school, or for parental convenience. The school district offers transportation to students who select open enrollment. Recently state law has extended open enrollment to include the entire state.

Programmatic diversity has been present for over 15 years in the St. Paul Public Schools. Options for students include Magnet schools, thematic schools, and alternative education at all levels. In addition, there are gifted and talented programs at the elementary and middle/junior high school levels and Montessori programs at the elementary level. These elements of diversity were implemented through study committees, administrative review, and board approval in response to parents' requests as well as to aid in the desegregation process. There is strong community support for the diverse programs often requiring waiting lists for some schools.

TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Choice Options: Limited Open Enrollment, Diversity

1010 East 10th Street, Tucson, Arizona 85719, (602) 882-2425
Contact: Dr. Gene Weber, Director of School Community Services

Profile: 56,475 students, urban setting; 10 high schools, 17 middle/junior high schools, 68 elementary schools; 2,841 teachers, 132 building administrators, 36 central office administrators.

Students in the Tucson Unified School District may attend a school outside of their enrollment/attendance boundaries if space is available and the transfer will improve the racial/ethnic balance at both sending and receiving schools. The school district provides transportation for those students exercising choice for purposes of desegregation, but not for those students who select school based upon the focus of the curriculum or the philosophy and teaching techniques of the school.

The Tucson School implemented diversity in response to the needs and expectations of the community. Magnet schools and gifted and talented programs have been in place for over 18 years at the elementary level, 10 years at the middle/junior high level, and for 5 years at the high school level. The middle school offers thematic schools and alternative education. The high schools offer alternative education also.

TULSA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Choice Options: Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

P.O. Box 470208, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74147, (918) 745-6294
Contact: Jerry Roger, Administrative Assistant for Instructional Support

Profile: 42,000 students, urban setting; 9 high schools, 17 middle/junior high schools, 63 elementary schools; 2500 teachers, 129 building administrators, 40 central office administrators.

In the area of open enrollment, the Tulsa Public Schools allow all students at all levels to choose a school outside of their normal attendance boundaries. Approximately 19% of the student population exercises this option. The school district does not provide transportation for these students.

Programmatic diversity exists in Tulsa in the form of Magnet schools and gifted and talented programs across all grade levels. Both of these programs have been operating for over 10 years.

The professional staff is empowered in the areas of the disposition of building funds, staff scheduling, staff assignments, the utilization of non-instructional staff time, and textbook selection. In addition, the staff participates in district policy development and planning.

UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Choice Options: Open Enrollment, Diversity, Limited Empowerment

51041 Shelby Road, Utica, Michigan, (313) 739-0400
Contact: Dr. Janet Jopke, Administrative Assistant

Profile: 25,000 students, suburban setting; 4 high schools, 7 middle/junior high schools, 23 elementary schools; 1200 teachers, 51 building administrators, 20 central office administrators.

The Utica Community School has an open enrollment policy for its students at all grade levels. With administrative approval, students may attend a school outside of their enrollment/attendance boundary. This option, exercised by about 1% of the district's population, is based on the focus of curriculum and philosophy and teaching techniques. Transportation is the responsibility of the parents.

Diverse programs in Utica were developed and implemented through staff involvement with curriculum, and communication with both staff and community. At the elementary level, there is a Montessori program. Also, a modified English open school focuses on experimental learning in an integrated curriculum. There are gifted and talented programs available at all grade levels. At the secondary level, there is a Japanese Institute where students learn the Japanese language and culture by specially trained staff members.

Empowerment exists for the building administrator and staff and extends to the community. The Standards of Quality evaluation process updates current curriculum and provides a base for textbook selection. Staff members are very much a part of this process. Several elementary schools are involved in a staff development project. On a volunteer basis, staff members share leadership in determining building themes, school-wide activities, and policies. On a district level, there is opportunity for staff participation in district policy development and planning. The Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), formed every 4-6 years, provides a framework for the staff and community to develop guidelines for current district needs and set goals for the future of the district.

WAUKEGAN SCHOOL DISTRICT

Choice Options: Open Enrollment, Diversity, Empowerment

1201 N. Sheridan Road, Waukegan, Illinois 60085, (312) 360-5400
Contact: Dr. Jack Taylor, Superintendent

Profile: 11,700 students, urban setting; 2 high schools, 3 middle/junior high schools, 15 elementary schools; 700 teachers, 30 building administrators, 12 central office administrators.

The Waukegan School District has an open enrollment policy that enables students to attend a school outside of of their own enrollment/attendance boundaries. This choice of schools is determined by the parents and students, and is exercised by over 60% of the student population. The choice of schools is available to students at all levels and is based upon the following factors: the focus of curriculum, the philosophy and teaching techniques of the schools, the quality of the neighborhoods and the co/extra-curricular activities. The Waukegan Schools provide transportation to those students who use this open enrollment option.

Within the past 10 years, the Waukegan School District developed many diverse programs within the schools. The middle/junior high schools house schools-within-schools and all three levels have Magnet schools, alternative education, and gifted and talented programs. This diversity is planned by the school board, administration, faculty, community, and students. Diversity helps to maintain racial balance in the district.

The professional staff makes decisions at the building level on the disposition of building funds, staff scheduling and assignments, utilization of non-instructional time, and textbook selection.

Oakland UNIVERSITY

Project to Access Choice in Education (PACE)
School of Human and Educational Services
Rochester, Michigan 48309-4401

Spring, 1988

Dear Educator:

Improving the effectiveness of schools is an issue on most educators' minds. Our research group, working under the auspices of Oakland University and the Metropolitan Affairs Corporation, is investigating one avenue toward better student outcomes - choice available in public schools throughout the country.

Because you are concerned about the improvement of schools in your own district, we request your assistance by providing information which we will ultimately use to compile a catalog of choices available in public education. The results of our study will be published by Oakland University and the Metropolitan Affairs Corporation and will be distributed to groups interested in alternatives to the traditional education model. For this reason, your immediate return of the enclosed questionnaire will be appreciated.

Thank you, in advance, for the insights and ideas we are certain you can contribute to our effort.

Sincerely,

Wendy Murdock

The Project to Access Choice in Education
Oakland University

The three components of choice on which we focus are *open enrollment, empowerment and diversity.* Specifically, *open enrollment* is the freedom for families to choose the elementary or secondary full-time public school of attendance. *Empowerment* is the opportunity for school staff to create its own organization and program components. *Diversity* is the creation or organization of program components reflecting differences in student and community needs, interests and preferences.

Section A.

The following questions pertain to *open enrollment* as it exists within your district. When responding to this questionnaire, please exclude students enrolled in special and vocational education programs from consideration.

We know and understand that there are differences among school districts. Patterns either occur or do not occur depending upon specific circumstances. By responding with an "x" in either the yes or no area, which of the following patterns occur in your district:

1. Within your school district, may students attend a school outside of their own enrollment/attendance boundaries? [yes] *if yes, continue* [no] *go to Sect.B. on pg 3*

2.

a. The school your students attend is determined by the school administration. [yes] [no]

b. The school your students attend is determined by parents. [yes] [no]

c The school your students attend is determined by the students themselves. [yes] [no]

d. The school your students attend is determined by court order. [yes] [no]

e. Choice of school is available to students in elementary schools. [yes] [no]

f. Choice of school is available to students in middle/junior high schools. [yes] [no]

g.	Choice of school is available to students in high schools.	[yes]	[no]
h.	Choice of schools is available to students with special talents (i.e., musically or artistically gifted).	[yes]	[no]
i.	Choice of schools is available to all students.	[yes]	[no]
j.	Students in your district can choose to attend schools outside your district's boundaries.	[yes]	[no]
k.	Students within your district can utilize the option of shared time with institutions of higher education.	[yes]	[no]
l.	Choice of school is based on the focus of curriculum.	[yes]	[no]
m.	Choice of school is based on the philosophy and teaching techniques of the school.	[yes]	[no]
n.	Choice of school is based on the quality of the neighborhood.	[yes]	[no]
o.	Choice of school is based on student friendship.	[yes]	[no]
p.	Choice is based on parent convenience.	[yes]	[no]
q.	Choice of school is based on co/extra-curricular interest.	[yes]	[no]
r.	The school district provides transportation to those exercising choice.	[yes]	[no]

SECTION B.

The following questions pertain to *diversity* as it exists in your district. *Diversity* is the creation or organization of program components reflecting differences in student and community needs, interests and preferences.

1. Listed below are some examples of diversity operating in education. Please circle the level at which each occurs, and indicate how long it has been in operation.

E = Elementary M = Middle/Junior High H = High School N = Not in operation

	PROGRAM	LEVEL				YEARS IN OPERATION
a.	Open Classrooms	E	M	H	N	_____
b.	Cooperative Learning	E	M	H	N	_____
c.	Cross-Age Grouping	E	M	H	N	_____
d.	Continuous Progress	E	M	H	N	_____
e.	Open Enrollment	E	M	H	N	_____
f.	Magnet Schools	E	M	H	N	_____
g.	Schools-Within-A-School	E	M	H	N	_____
h.	Alternative Education	E	M	H	N	_____
i.	Schools of Choice	E	M	H	N	_____
j.	Thematic Schools	E	M	H	N	_____
k.	Team Teaching	E	M	H	N	_____
l.	Block Time	E	M	H	N	_____
m.	Montessori	E	M	H	N	_____
n.	Gifted/Talented	E	M	H	N	_____
o.	Writing Across Curriculum	E	M	H	N	_____
p.	Site-Based Management	E	M	H	N	_____
r.	Year-Round Schools	E	M	H	N	_____
s.	Other-please explain on reverse	E	M	H	N	_____

2. What was the procedure used in your district to implement the examples of diversity you listed?

3. Could you please list the reasons why these examples of diversity were implemented in your district.

4. In your district, who was responsible for this planned diversity? Please check as many as apply.

a._____School Board
b._____Central Office
c._____Parents
d._____Community Members
e._____Students
f._____Faculty
g._____BuildingAdmin.
h._____Other-please explain below

5. In your district, would you consider the diversity you listed successful? Please circle one and explain below (with specific examples when possible).

Yes No Other

Section C.

The following questions pertain to empowerment as it exists in your district. Empowerment is the opportunity for the school staff to create its own organization and program components.

1. Discounting the role of the Board of Education, does the professional staff at the building level, either individually or collectively, make final decisions in the following areas:

a) disposition of building funds	[yes]	[no]
b) hiring of building staff	[yes]	[no]
c) staff scheduling and assignments	[yes]	[no]
d) utilization of non-instructional staff time (i.e., in-service, conference time, etc.)	[yes]	[no]
e) textbook selection	[yes]	[no]

2. Do professional staff actively participate in district policy development and planning? [yes] [no]

3. Are there other examples of empowerment which exist in your district which were not mentioned above? Please explain.

Section D.

The following descriptive information would be extremely helpful if it could be provided:

1. Number of students in your district _____

2. Number of students exercising the open enrollment option. _____

3. Number of faculty employed in your district _____

4. Number of building administrators employed by your district. _____

5. Number of central office administrators(superintendents, assistant/associate superintendents, directors, coordinators) employed in your district. _____

6. Number of high schools in your district _____

7. Number of middle/junior high schools in your district _____

8. Number of elementary schools in your district _____

9. Would you consider your district to be rural, urban or suburban? _____

Section E.

1. This survey has touched on the subjects of *open enrollment, diversity and empowerment* in education. Is there anything else you would like to add about these topics and how they pertain to your district?

   [yes] [no]
   please explain

2. Are you anticipating or not anticipating changes in your policy regarding *open enrollment, diversity and empowerment* in the next twelve months? Please explain.

3. Who may we contact for further information?

   _____ _____
   Name Position

   _____
   Phone Number

   Name of School District _____

   Address of School District _____

   _____

   Respondent's Name _____

   Respondent's Position _____

4. Do you know of any other districts where any or all of these topics are operational? Please list.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your assistance.

Annotated Bibliography

Banach, William J. [1987] *Toward the Year 2000: Dilemmas Facing Education.* Mt. Clemens, Michigan: The Vista 2000 Group. Dr. Banach and the Vista 2000, a group of concerned citizens and educators, discuss how schools must change in order to meet societal needs as we move into the 21st century.

Casner-Lotto, Jill. [January, 1988] "Expanding the Teacher's Role". *Phi Delta Kappan*, v. 69,n. 5, 349-353. In Hammond, Indiana, a school improvement effort, known as School Improvement Process, gives teachers a significant voice in decision making and in shaping programs that will be best suited to the needs of their students. This article documents the process used in implementing the SIP program and the progress achieved since the program began in 1982.

Clancy, Peter L. [1982] *19 Improving Schools and Why.* Ypsilanti, Michigan: Eastern Michigan University. This is a research study of community education programs, and the impact such programs have on a child's academic achievement. The author explains the unique methods of research that he used to identify and analyze improving schools. The results of a symposium conducted by Mr. Clancy, with remarks and criticisms of the author's work by a panel of experts are included in the book.

Clinchy, Evans. [January, 1987] *A Consumers Guide to Schools of Choice for Parents and Other Educators.* Boston, Massachusetts: Institute for Responsive Education. This publication is intended to give parents and educators real-life descriptions of what actually goes on in schools of choice. It sketches daily activities in ten schools in six different school districts in Massachusetts and New York.

Detroit Public Schools. [1986-1987] *Schools of Choice, Unique Educational Alternatives.* A set of pamphlets that give specific descriptions of diverse programs in the Detroit Public Schools that are available to students at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

Fizzell, Robert. [June, 1987] "Inside a School of Choice". *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 758-760. Mr. Fizzell believes that allowing students to choose their own schools benefits both students and their teachers. The author describes the philosophy of one such school: the Alternative Learning Center in Vancouver, Washington.

Goodland, John I. [1984] *A Place Called School.* McGraw-Hill Book Company. In this book the author describes the similarities and differences between 38 schools that he and his staff studied. Characteristics of successful schools are noted, and a plan for school improvement, developed by Mr. Goodland, is explained.

Maeroff, Gene I. [1988] *The Empowerment of Teachers.* New York, New York: Teachers College Press. Mr. Maeroff presents a strong case for raising the status of the teaching profession. By allowing teachers more autonomy and involvement in policy setting as well as recognizing their needs as educators, the author suggests that only then will teaching be thought of as a true "profession". The end result of this "professionalization" would be an improved educational setting for our children.

Metropolitan Affairs Corporation. [August, 1986] *Dialogue For Change.* Detroit, Michigan. This report contains proposals for change in education, followed by a discussion and debate about those proposals. Included is a summary update of developments in educational change since 1985.

Nathan, Joe. [June, 1987] *Choice and Excellence in Public Education.* Detroit, Michigan: Metropolitan Affairs Corporation. A document that includes remarks by Joe Nathan concerning the concepts of choice and empowerment in K-12 education. Dr. Nathan, in his discussion, demonstrates the need for empowerment and choice.

Raywid, Mary Anne. "Alternative Schools as a Model for Public Education". *Theory Into Practice* v. 22, n. 3, 190-196. In this article the author presents her

definition of an alternative school. She explains why alternative schools have evolved and the reasons that they work. Ms. Raywid lists the advantages and benefits that alternative schools have over traditional schools.

Raywid, Mary Anne. [Winter, 1985] "Family Choice Arrangements in Public Schools: A review of the Literature". *Review of Educational Research* v. 55, n. 4, 435-467. This paper reviews the history of choice opportunities in public schools. It looks at the development of tracking, individual alternative schools, and option systems. It offers detailed examinations of several choice models that have proved widespread: open enrollment plans, Magnet schools, schools within schools, satellites and separate alternatives, and inter-district choice plans.

Snider, William. [June 24, 1987] "The Call for Choice: Competition in the Educational Marketplace". *Education Week* pp. C1-C24. The author contends that the concept of choice holds vast potential for revitalizing public schools. There is already much evidence to support this including test scores, community involvement, teacher renewal, and consumer demand. This article is a study of the choice concept and the positive consequences that occur when choice is implemented.

Bibliography

Bacharach, Samuel B., Conley, Sharon C. [May, 1986] "Education Reform: A Managerial Agenda". *Phi Delta Kappan* v. 67, n. 9, 641-645.

Banach, William J. [1987] *Toward the Year 2000: Dilemmas Facing Education.* Mt. Clemens, Michigan: The Vista 2000 Group.

Banas, Casey. [October 25, 1987] "Miami's Public Schools Find Reform That Works". *Chicago Tribune.*

Beck, Melinda, Springer, Karen. [July 4, 1988] "A School System Near Meltdown". *Newsweek* pp. 60-61.

Bennis, Warren, and Nanus, Burt. [1985] *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge,* New York, New York: Harper and Row Publishers Inc.

Berkowitz, David. [December 10, 1987] "Innovation Needed, Dr. Fernandez Says". *West Kendall Gazette.*

Blank, Rolf K. et. al. [1983] *Survey of Magnet Schools — Final Report: Analyzing a Model for Quality Integrated Education.* Washington: H. Lowery and Associates.

Bloomer, Joan M. [September, 1986] "Diversity as an Avenue of Excellence". *Clearing House* v. 60, 18-21.

Bowen, Ezra. [December 2, 1985] "Way, Way Back to Basics: One-room Schools Hold Their Own in the Battle Against Extinction". *Time* v. 126, 82-84.

Brandt, Ron. [February, 1988] "On Changing Secondary Schools: A Conversation with Ted Sizer". *Educational Leadership* v. 45, n. 5, 30-36.

Broches, Charles, Gore, William, Williams, Don, Lostoski, Cinthia. [November-December, 1987] "One Faculty's Perception of its Governance Role". *Journal of Higher Education* v. 58, 629.

Buckley, Jerry. [January 18, 1988] "A Blueprint for Better Schools". *US News and World Report* pp. 60-65.

Burger, Ellis. [October 17, 1987] "Fernandez Tells Teachers to Seek Voice in Decisions". *Miami News.*

Burger, Ellis. [February 20, 1988] "Pat Tarnello's Reformation". *Miami News.*

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. [1986] *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.* New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Casner-Lotto, Jill. [January 1988] "Expanding the Teacher's Role: Hammond's School Improvement Process". *Phi Delta Kappan* v. 69, n. 5, 354-356.

_____ . [1988] *Challenges for School Leaders.* American Association of School Administrators.

Cheakalas, Christina. [May 6, 1987] "Teachers Get a Chance to Help Run Their Schools", *Miami Herald Neighbors.*

Clancy, Peter L. [1982] *19 Improving Schools and Why.* Ypsilanti, Michigan: Eastern Michigan University.

Clinchy, Evans. [January, 1987] *A Consumers Guide to Schools of Choice.* Boston, Massachusetts: Institute for Responsive Education.

Clinchy, Evans. [January, 1985] "Coming: A New Role for Magnet Schools". *Principal* p. 7.

Clinchy, Evans. [January, 1987] *Planning for Parent Choice.* Boston, Massachusetts: Institute for Responsive Education.

Correiro, John, Barney, Martin E., Condon, Marjorie. [February, 1988] *A Description of the Planning and Implementation Process.* Fall River, Massachusetts: Fall River Public Schools.

Curley, June. [May, 1988] "Site Based Management Flourishes". *The School Administrator* v. 45, n. 5, 31-34.

Dade County Public Schools, Bureau of Financial Affairs. [1987] "School Based Budget System".

Dade County Public Shools. [October, 1988] "School-Based Management / Shared-Decision Making Pilot Program — A Historical Perspective". Miami, Florida.

_____ . "Dade County Teachers Value Making School Decisions". [January 25, 1988] *Education USA.*

Detroit Public Schools. [1986-1987] *Schools of Choice, Unique Educational Alternatives.*

Drucker, Peter F. The Age of Discontinuity: Guidelines to Our Changing Society. New York: Harper & Row.

Feirson, Robert. [April, 1987] "A Model for Assessing Team Meetings". *Clearing House* v. 60, 360-363.

Fernandez, Joseph. [October 15, 1987] "Spiraling Numbers Launch School Business Into Era of 'Satellites'". *Leadership News* p. 3.

First, Patricia F. [Winter, 1988] "Issues Affecting the Preparation of Educational Administration as the Societal Paradigm Shifts". *AASA Professor* v. 10, n. 3, 9-12.

Fiske, Edward B. [January 13, 1988] "Grass-roots Reform in Miami Experiment". *New York Times.*

Fiske, Edward B. [January 10, 1988] "Miami Schools: Laboratory for Major Changes". *New York Times.*

Fizzell, Robert. [June, 1987] "Inside a School of Choice". *Phi Delta Kappan* v. 68, n. 10, 758-760.

Fleming, Patricia, Blank, Rolf et al. [September, 1982] *Survey of Magnet Schools: Interim Report.* Washington: James H. Lowry and Associates.

Freedberg, Louis. [January 3, 1988] "Turning Schools Over to Teachers". *Sacramento Bee.*

Gallup, Alec. [September, 1986] "The 18th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public Attitudes Toward the Public Schools". *Phi Delta Kappan* v. 67, n. 9, 43-59.

Gardner, John W. [January, 1986] *Leadership Papers/1 The Nature of Leadership Introductory Considerations.* Washington D.C.: Independent Sector.

Gardner, John W. [March, 1986] *Leadership Papers/2 The Task of Leadership.* Washington D.C.: Independent Sector.

Gardner, John W. [June, 1986] *Leadership Papers/3 The Heart of the Matter.* Washington D.C.: Independent Sector.

Gardner, John W. [October, 1986] *Leadership Papers/4 Leadership and Power.* Washington D.C.: Independent Sector.

Glatthorn, Allen A. [April, 1987] "Teacher Autonomy vs Curricular Anarchy". *NASSP Bulletin* v. 71, 77-84.

Gomez-Cantens, Gloria. [November 11, 1987] "Program Teaches Area Students Computer Skills". *South Dade New Leader.*

Goodlad, John I. [1984] *A Place Called School Prospects for the Future.* McGraw-Hill Book Company.

_____. "Groups Call for More Collegiality Between Principals and Teachers". [December, 1986] *Phi Delta Kappan* v. 68, 254-256.

Guthrie, James W. [December, 1986] "School-based Management: The Next Needed Education Reform". *Phi Delta Kappan* v. 68, 305-310.

Hallifad, Jackie. [February 28, 1988] "Reforms in Dade County Schools". *Stuart News.*

Hodgkinson, Harold L. [1987] *Michigan: The State and Its Educational System.* The Institute for Educational Leadership.

Howe, Harold II, and Edelman, Wright, Marian. [1985] *Barriers to Excellence: Our Children at Risk.* Boston, Massachusetts: National Coalition of Advocates for Students.

_____. "How One School District Empowered Its Teachers". [October, 1987] *Excellence in Education Newsletter* pp. 1-4.

Jaska, George. [May 19, 1988] "Despite School Closings More Slated for Layoffs". *Flint Journal.* Flint, Michigan. p. 11 A.

Jennings, Lisa. [June 22, 1988] "'Schools for 21st Century' Project Is Taking Off". *Education Week* v. 7, n. 39, 10.

Kilch Kuae Noel. [December 10, 1987] "Teachers Putting Hands-On Learning Ahead of Theories". *Miami Herald.*

Kirst, Michael. [January, 1988] "Who Should Control Our Schools?" *NEA Today.*

Korschgen, Ann, Wilkins, Gilbert M. [October, 1985] "Teacher Flight — Yes or Guess? Wisconsin Teachers Have Not Been Leaving the Profession in Significant Numbers". *Phi Delta Kappan* v. 67, 148-150.

Levine, Merle P. [April, 1987] "For Educational Excellence Academic Leaders Need a Purpose". *NASSP Bulletin* v. 71, 43-48.

Lewis, Anne. [September, 1987] "Public Schools Offer Vast Choices". *School Administrator* pp. 8-11.

Maeroff, Gene I. [March, 1988] "A Blueprint for Empowering Teachers". *Phi Delta Kappan* v. 69, n. 7.

Maeroff, Gene I. [March 23, 1988] "The Empowerment of Teachers". *Education Week* v. 7, n. 26, 25.

Maeroff, Gene I. [1988] *The Empowerment of Teachers.* New York, New York: Teachers College Press.

Marshall, Aretha. [April, 1987] *Executive Summary, Recommendations and Findings.* Parental Choice Task Force, Detroit Public Schools.

_____ . *Magnetize for Success Program Guide.* [1988] Office of Community Relations, Flint Community Schools: Flint, Michigan.

Marshall, Aretha. [February, 1988] *Report of Parental Choice Task Force.* Detroit Public Schools.

McCarthy, Alice. [April 3, 1988] "PTA to Focus on Education Partnership". *Detroit Free Press* p. 1 J.

McPike, Liz. [Spring, 1987] "Shared Decision Making at the School Site: Moving Toward a Professional Model". Interview of Mr. Patrick O'Rourke, President of Hammond teacher's union. *American Educator.*

Meier, Deborah. [June, 1987] "Central Park East: An Alternative Story". *Phi Delta Kappan* v. 68, n. 10, 753-757.

Metropolitan Affairs Corporation. [August, 1986] *Dialogue for Change.* Detroit, Michigan.

Metz, Mary. [January, 1988] "In Education, Magnets Attract Controversy". *NEA Today* pp. 54-60.

Michaels, Ken. [February, 1988] "Caution: Second-Wave Reform Taking Place". *Educational Leadership* v. 45, n. 5, 3.

Mitzelfeld, Jim. [August 18, 1988] "Report: Let Parents Choose Kids' Schools". *Detroit Free Press.* Detroit, Michigan.

Mueller, Van. [June, 1987] "Choice: The Parents' Perspective". *Phi Delta Kappan* v. 68, n. 10, 758-760.

Nathan, Joe. [June, 1987] *Choice and Excellence in Public Education.* Detroit, Michigan: Metropolitan Affairs Corporation.

Nathan, Joe. [1983] *Free to Teach.* Pilgrim Press.

Nathan, Joe. [June, 1987] "Results and Future Prospects of State Efforts to Increase Choice Among Schools". *Phi Delta Kappan* v. 68, n. 10, 746-752.

Olson, Lynn. [December 2, 1987] "The Sky's the Limit — Dade Ventures Self Governance". *Education Week* v. 7, n. 13.

Olson, Lynn. [January 27, 1988] "Children Flourish Here". *Education Week* v. 7, n. 18, 1.

Ordovensky, Pat. [February 29, 1988] "Top School Leaders Agree on Teacher Empowerment". *Leadership News* p. 9.

Palaniuk, Stef. [Spring, 1987] "Administrators in the Classroom: Where Else?" *Education* v. 107, 272-276.

Patterson, Jerry L. [October, 1987] "How One School District Empowered Its Teachers". *Excellence in Education Newsletter* pp. 1-3.

_____ . "Plan for Seattle Schools Aims to Reduce Bussing". [June 10, 1988] *New York Times.*

Powell, Arthur G., Farrar, Eleanor, and Cohen, David K. [1985] *The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Marketplace.* Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Raywid, Mary Anne. "Alternative Schools as a Model for Public Education". *Theory Into Practice* v. 22, n. 3, 190-196.

Raywid, Mary Anne. [Winter, 1985] "Family Choice Arrangements in Public Schools: A Review of the Literature". *Review of Educational Research* v. 55, 435-467.

Raywid, Mary Anne. [October 4, 1984] "Preparing Teachers for Schools of Choice". *National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education* pp. 1-26.

Raywid, Mary Anne. [June, 1987] "Public Choice, Yes; Vouchers, No!" *Phi Delta Kappan* v. 68, n. 10, 762-769.

Raywid, Mary Anne. [April, 1988] "Synthesis of Research on Schools of Choice". *Education Leadership* pp. 70-78.

Raywid, Mary Anne. [1982] *The Current Status of Schools of Choice in Public Secondary Education.* Hempstead, New York: Project on Alternatives in Education, Hofstra University.

Robichaud, Mark. [April 11, 1988] "Kids Help Decide Where the Money Goes". *Miami Herald.*

Rodman, Blake. [September 30, 1987] "Friendship and Trust: Unusual Keys to a Radical Pact". *Education Week* v. 7, n. 4, 120-121.

Rothman, Robert. [March 23, 1988] "Teachers vs Curriculum in Philadelphia?" *Education Week* v. 7, n. 4, 1, 20.

Saterlie, Mary Ellen. [May, 1988] "Developing Community Concensus for Teaching Values". *Educational Leadership,* v. 45, n. 8, 44-47.

Schwartz, Amy E. [February 20, 1988] "Dade's Great Experiment — Let a School Run Itself". *Miami Herald,* reprinted from *Washington Post.*

Serfiovanni, Thomas J. [April 22, 1988] "Empowering Principals and Teachers as a Collaborative Team". Troy, Michigan: Institute for Educational Management.

Schwartz, Amy E. [January 29, 1988] "Letting Schools Run Themselves". *Washington Post.*

Shanker, Albert. [September, 1986] "Teachers Must Take Charge". *Educational Leadership* v. 44, n. 1, 12-13.

Shaw, Cathy. [February 7, 1988] "Teachers Flourishing in Management Role". *Miami Herald.*

Sickler, Joan. [January, 1988] "Teachers in Charge: Empowering the Professionals". *Phi Delta Kappan* v. 69, n. 5, 354-356.

Sizer, Theodore R. [1984] *Horace's Compromise — The Dilemma of the American High School.* Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Snider, William. [May 4, 1988] "Minnesota Backs Nation's First 'Choice' System". *Education Week* v. 7, n. 32, 1.

Snider, William. [June 15, 1988] "'Package' in Baton Rouge: Choice and School-Based Management". *Education Week* v. 7, n. 38, 1-24.

Snider, William. [May 18, 1988] "School Choice: New, More Efficient 'Sorting Machine'?". *Education Week* v. 7, n. 34, 1, 8.

Snider, William. [June 24, 1987] "The Call for Choice: Competition in the Educational Marketplace". *Education Week* pp. C2-C11.

Spratling, Cassandra. [April 10, 1988] "Alternative Public Schools Offer More Choices, But Some Critics See Elitism". *Detroit Free Press.*

Steffens, Heidi. [December, 1987] "Putting Teachers Firmly in Charge". *NEA Today* v. 6, n. 6.

Tannenbaum, Robert, Schmidt, Warren. "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern". *Harvard Business Review* pp. 95-101.

_____. "Teachers Get a Chance to Improve the Schools". [December 1, 1987] editorial in *Miami News.*

The Institute for Advancing Educational Management. [October, 1987] "How One School District Empowered Its Teachers". *Excellence in Education Newsletter* pp. 1-3.

Tucker, Marc S. [February, 1988] "Peter Drucker, Knowledge Work, and the Structure of Schools". *Educational Leadership* v. 45, n. 5, 44-46.

Turtle, Candace M. [May 6, 1987] "Schools to Give Home Rule a Try". *Miami Herald Neighbors.*

Urbanski, Adam. [October 28, 1987] "Restructuring the Teaching Profession". *Education Week* v. 7, n. 8, 32.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. [April, 1987] "Population Profile of the United States 1984-1985" c3. 186/8: 984-85.

Wangberg, Elaine G. [October, 1987] "Listening to Teachers". *Clearing House* v. 61, 76-81.

Weintraub, Robert. [January, 1985] "A School Where Everyone Shares Power". *Principal* pp. 11-12.

Wussberg, Linda R. [February 18, 1988] "Sunset High Tests School-Based Management". *West Kendall Gazette.*

Tsapatsaris, George. [January, 1985] "How We Magnetized a City School System". *Principal* pp. 8-10.

Zerchykov, Ross. [February, 1987] *Parent Choice: A Digest of Research.* Boston, Massachusetts: Institute for Responsive Education.

Metropolitan Affairs Corporation
1988 Officers and Board of Directors

President. . . . . .Robert C. Larson
Vice President, Business. . . . . .Robert R. Reilly
Vice President, Government. . . . . .Nancy L. Davis
Vice President, Labor. . . . . .Marc Stepp
Secretary. . . . . .David Baker Lewis
Treasurer. . . . . .William R. Halling

Executive Director. . . . . .John M. Amberger

Dr. David Adamany
President
Wayne State University

Dr. Robert Keith Archer
Board Member
Southeastern Michigan
Transportation Authority

Ralph H. Booth
President & Treasurer
Booth American Company

Richard J. Burstein
Partner
Honigman Miller Schwartz & Cohn

Nancy L. Davis
Supervisor, Ann Arbor Township
Chairperson, SEMCOG

Edgar L. Doss
Metro Region General Manager
Consumers Power Company

Stephen Ewing
President and Chief Operating
Officer, Michigan Consolidated Gas
Company

James R. Flaherty
Partner
Touche Ross Co.

Geraldine Bledsoe Ford
Recorder's Court Judge
City of Detroit

G. Stewart Francke
Executive Director
State & Local Government Relations
General Motors Corporation

Michael J. Friduss
Vice President
Personnel and Administration
Michigan Bell

Richard M. Gabrys
Managing Partner
Deloitte, Haskins & Sells

Ralph J. Gerson
Executive Vice President
Guardian Industries Corporation

Michael M. Glusac
Director
Government Affairs
Chrysler Corporation

William R. Halling
Managing Partner
Peat Marwick Main & Co.

Joseph L. Hudson Jr.
President
Detroit Medical Center Corporation

Robert L. Jones
American Natural Resources
Company

George F. Killeen
Chairperson
SEMTA

Robert C. Larson
President
The Taubman Company, Inc.

David Baker Lewis
Partner
Lewis White & Clay, P.C.

Walter J. McCarthy, Jr.
Chairman of the Board &
Chief Executive Officer
Detroit Edison

Douglas C. McClintock
Managing Partner
Arthur Andersen & Co.

Edward H. McNamara
County Executive
Wayne County

Jane Hale Morgan

Charles A. Muer
President
C.A. Muer Corporation

Daniel T. Murphy
County Executive
Oakland County

John Rakolta, Jr.
President
Walbridge Aldinger & Co.

Robert R. Reilly
Executive Director
Corporate Strategy
Ford Motor Company

Mark K. Rosenfeld
President
Jacobson Stores, Inc.

Alan E. Schwartz
Senior Partner
Honigman Miller Schwartz & Cohn

Howard F. Sims
Chairman
Sims, Varner & Associates

Robert E. Smith
President
Livingston County Intermediate School
District

Ronald L. Steffens
Vice President, Marketing
Automobile Club of Michigan

Marc Stepp
Vice President
International Union-UAW

Richard Strichartz
Senior Vice President,
General Counsel and Secretary
Michigan National Corporation

S. Martin Taylor
President
New Detroit, Inc.

Lucius Theus
Director, Civic Affairs
Allied Corporation

Thomas Turner
President
Metropolitan Detroit AFL-CIO

David V. Van Howe
Consulting Vice President
The Stroh Companies, Inc.

Gerald E. Warren
Senior Vice President
Public Affairs Division
National Bank of Detroit

James R. Waterston
Vice Chairman
Comerica Incorporated

Nancy J. White
President
League of Women Voters of Michigan

Stanley J. Winkelman
Stanley Winkelman Associates

James W. Woodruff
President
Woodruff Oldsmobile, Inc.

Coleman A. Young
Mayor
City of Detroit

B. David Sanders
Manager

Metropolitan Affairs Corporation Publications

The reports below have been published by Metropolitan Affairs Corporation. Initial copies are available by calling (313) 961-2270 or writing Metropolitan Affairs Corporation at 660 Plaza Drive, Suite 1900, Detroit, Michigan, 48226-1822

Intergovernmental Cooperative Arrangements: Exploring Opportunities, December, 1982

Venture Capital Financing: Opportunities and Needs in Southeast Michigan, January, 1983

The Challenge of Hazardous Waste Facility Siting in Michigan, December, 1985

An Evaluation of the Joint Public Ventures Assistance Program of the Metropolitan Affairs Corporation, February, 1986

Michigan's Hazardous Waste Facility Siting Process as Revised, August, 1988

The Chronically Jobless of Greater Detroit, September 1988